

PACIFICATION

Touching the

Doctrinal Dissent

Among our

United Brethren in LONDON.

BEING

An Answer to Mr. *Williams* and Mr. *Sole*, both, who have
appealed in one Point (collected for an Error) to this
Author, for his Determination about it.

TOGETHER

With some other more necessary Points falling in: As also
that *Case* of *Non-resistance*, which hath always been a
Case of that Grand Concern to the State, and now more
especially, in regard to our Loyalty to King *William*,
and Association for him, *Resolved*, on the Occasion.

By Mr. JOHN HUMFREY.

*They were wont to speak in old time, saying, They will surely
ask counsel at Abel, and so they ended the matter,
2 Sam. 20. 18.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for T. Parkhurst at the Bible and Three
Crowns in Cheap-side, 1696.

PACIFICATION.

PART I.

THERE having been so little Reason for the Interruption of that Union, which was made between the Nonconformist Ministers in *London*, without distinguishing Presbyterian and Independent, the Government of both over their particular gathered Congregations being (as the case stands) coincident as to the main : And our Expectations of some more general Meeting of both for Reconciliation, suffering hitherto Disappointment; it does seem even necessary to me, for stirring up the Brethren to this Work, that the Difference between them, which is not *healed* but *sleeps*, should be awakened, and *must* be awakened, and brought again to Agitation, till the matter be composed. *Must* I say, not in regard to the setting a few righter in their Judgments whom I think out (which yet is also intended,) but in regard to this more general end of composing the Nonconformist Body. For which Composure then, there must be now either an Agreement of All in the same Points, which can never be, for the Understanding of diverse Men will be diverse as their Faces are diverse, and I cannot approve of any Man's going about a weak and vain obtaining that: Or else an Agreement only in Practice and Love, leaving every Brother Free to abound in his own Sense, as to these Points wherein we differ, so long as they indanger not the Foundation. This is that I count is to be done, to which end, Having printed one Sheet with some Animadversions on certain Exceptions against Mr. *Williams's* Books, Mr. *W.* thought good to answer these Exceptions himself in another Sheet directed to me; and Mr. *Lobb* hath answered his Sheet in four or five. There is one Point (as appears there) collected for an Error, wherein they have both appealed to me, and I have said something to it : But having not then by me

Mr. *W's* Books, I referred the Matter to the Brethren when they meet, and to his Books with this Adjustment, That if that Error upon Examination was not found in them, Mr. *Lobb* should ask his Pardon; if it was, then did Mr. *W.* deserve rebuke (not because he erred as all do in some things, but because he denies the Error to be there) and should very honestly confess it, that so all might be made up. By this means one of them shall get *Love* in such an ingenuous Acknowledgment, and the other *Victory*. I have since been accommodated with Mr. *W's* Books, and have looked into them, and find it harder than I thought, to tell unto whose share the *Love* and *Ingenuity* must fall.

In the Preface of Mr. *W.* to his Book of *Gospel-Truth*, in the third Leaf are these words, *The Gospel hath another Sanction to the Preceptive part of the Law than the Covenant of Works had. This change of the Sanction supposeth the Death of Christ, and his honouring the Law by his perfect Obedience.* Upon these words Mr. *Lobb* collects that Mr. *W.* holds, that there is a *Change of the Penal Sanction of the Law*, which we count an Error.

These are Mr. *W's* words, and lye together in the same Page, and as to the Construction thereof, I being appealed unto do premise this. That the Gospel hath another Sanction than the Covenant of Works, is a Truth on Mr. *W's* side, and Mr. *Lobb* will grant it: That there is no Change of the Penal Sanction of the Law, is a Truth on Mr. *Lobb's* side, and Mr. *W.* will grant it. But whether *the Gospel hath another Sanction to the Preceptive part of the Law*, and, *There is a Change of the Penal Sanction of the Law*, be the same, is the Question.

Unto the Decision hereof thus much I have said in Mr. *Lobb's* Sheets before I examined Mr. *W's* Books, that a *Change of the Sanction*, and *Another Sanction*, is all one. And so far I am right, because so much is intended by Mr. *W.* as appears by the words conjoyn'd and urg'd by Mr. *Lobb*: But whether a *Change of the Sanction*, or *Another Sanction* (being all one) to the *Preceptive part of the Law*, as taken into the Gospel in Mr. *W's* Sense, be a *Change of the Penal Sanction of the Law* in Mr. *Lobb's* Sense, is still the Question.

Before I come to the passing Judgment, it will be most to Edification, in the first place, to understand and state the Point it self. Some Worthy Divines (says Mr. *Baxter*) say, All the Law of Innocency is ceased, Precept, Promise, and Threatning. *Cessante sapientie subjecti Lex cessat.* Others say that all are still in force:

force : Himself saith, the *Precept* and *Threat* is; but the *Promise* only, through our Incapacity, *does cease*. Now let these *Worthy Divines* that say, the whole ceases, explain their Tenent, and let us see what they draw from it, and if there be nothing in the Matter explain'd, but what we can approve in ours, let them, in God's name, enjoy their Scheme of Thoughts, and we our own. *God hath abolished the Covenant of Works, by substituting a new one in room of it*, says Dr. Owen, as Mr. W. hath quoted him, *Def. Gosp. P. 44.* Mr. Lobb does not, must not say, that none but *Socinians* are of that Opinion. There is something now here accordingly, that Mr. W. holds, and Mr. Lobb thinks to be an Error : But what does Mr. W. say upon it ? Is there any thing he deduces from thence that is dangerous, or of evil Consequence, to be re-proved ? Is there any thing delivered in his *Explication* but what Mr. Lobb approves, and does himself, and his Brethren deliver, and preach, if he preach at all, or preach the Gospel ? If the Deductions he makes from his *Truth*, and the Deductions Mr. W. makes from that *Error*, be the same Doctrine, and that which is found and necessary to Salvation, what reason is there for all such to be Chid, that cannot bear one with another ?

Mr. Lawson that Judicious Divine (of whom Mr. Baxter says somewhere, that he learned more of him than any one living) does say, that *They who hold that the Law remains the same, and that God as Rector by Substitution transferring the Punishment merited by Transgressions upon Christ, and in consideration of Satisfaction made by him remits Sin, so that here is nothing but a Relaxation or Interpretation of it, do Err.* In another place he says likewise, *To think that the Promise, Threat and Obligation of the Law of Works continue under the Gospel is an Error.* He concludes, that the *Law of Works*, not *Moral Law*, is abrogated. This Resolution I rest not upon, as something dark and too short, for how solidly soever he speaks of the *Obligation of the Law*, yet hath he not fully ventured to determine this Point, and I think could not do it. Mr. Baxter therefore tying not himself to Mr. Lawson's Opinion, is singular in his own. The *Precept* and *Threat* (says he) *is of force*, but the *Promise* only *ceases*. This is his brief State of the Point, and I think it rare so piercing a Man should take up with it. Did Christ come from Heaven to Earth, to take on him our Nature, and put himself under the Law, to obey it perfectly, and suffer the Penalty to Redeem us from it ; and is this all that Freedom, that Deliverance we have from it, that the Promissory part ceases ?

What

What Benefit is there in that? We are incapable to perform the Condition of the Law (*says he*) and therefore the Promise is void. But neither what this excellent Man *says* here is true, nor is it the thing which should be said. It is not *the Thing*, because the delivery of us from the Law (which the Scripture speaks of as the Purchase of Christ) is the freeing us from the Curse and Condemnation of it. To be freed from the Promise, what good (*I say*) is that? And it is not *true*, because the Lord Jesus, a Man as we are, did perform the Condition, and made the Reward thereby due to him of Debt, or Merit, and accordingly entred into Glory. *The Man Christ* (*I said in my Sheet*) *was obliged to an Obedience of the Moral Law, that he might himself have Right, Jure & merito fœderis operum, to Life Eternal.*

Well then you may say, if I be not lead by neither of these, what is Mr. *Humfrey's* own Opinion and State of the Point? I answer, The second Opinion which Mr. *Baxter* counts *Extream*; and Mr. *Lawson* says is an *Error*, I take to be *Truth*, and own, that the Law of Nature, or *Works*, continues (wholly as to us) in his *Precepts*, *Promise*, and *Threat* unabolished. *Do we make void the Law through Faith? God forbid; yea we establish it.* I have formerly thus explained and stated my Judgment. The Moral Law, or Law of Nature, is a Law, or Rule of Life or Manners, *in it self* consider'd (*I count*) without the *Sanction*, that is not Essential to it. The Duty which it requires (arising from God's Nature and Ours) is owing to God, if he had made no Promise of *Reward*, or threatned no *Punishment*, for the breach of it; and God's putting a *Sanction* to it, makes that Law a *Covenant*. Now in a Covenant there are two Parties, and consequently there is *Our* part, and *God's* part, in this Covenant. On our part the Law I count, being the Law and Covenant of Nature; does and must continue *unchangeable*, and Man not performing perfect Obedience, and yet bound to it, is in the Hand of his Judge (otherwise above the Law) to dispose of him as he pleases. Every Sin against it (though the least) maketh Punishment due (the Threat declares and constitutes a *Debitum*, though not *Eventum*,) that is, deserves it: But as to God's part, the Case is alter'd. Here is the business. We are by this Law or Covenant, through our Sin (we and all the World) in God's hand, lyable to Wrath and Condemnation, and God as Rector and Judge does stand engaged to deal with us according to it: But upon a voluntary and allowed Mediation of his Son, and Satisfaction given in our behalf, which

he

he might accept, to the fulfilling the Ends of the Law, better than by Man's Punishment, he executes not the Law upon him.

There are two Reasons upon which (when they meet) a Law-giver who is also Rector, may forbear the Punishing a Criminal. One is, when the Case is Pittiable, and requires Commiseration: And the other, when his Justice and Honour can be saved also, though he spare the Person. Such is the Case here, If God deal with Man according to this Law, all Mankind must Perish, which is Pittiable indeed; and it pleased him in his Wisdom to find out, and in his Goodness to permit and appoint, that the Lord Jesus his Son should interpose so as by fulfilling the Law exactly for himself, and bearing the Punishment of it also in our stead, here is no Dishonour can be cast on himself, or Law, by his dealing otherwise on his part with us than the Covenant required. By this means did God pay its due Respect to his Law, seeing, as he required at first the Performance of it as the Condition of Life, and when it was broke would have his Son re-honour it and fulfil it, so he would not pardon the Sinner in point of Justice, without an Hostage and Satisfaction. But now amends being made him amply by such a Mediator he dispenses with the Penalty, as to us, so that the Law here becomes not *Abrogated* nor *Ceased*, but properly *Relaxed*. It is not an *Abrogation* or *Cessation*, or an *Interpretation* (an *ἐρμηνεία*) but (whatever the Skilful Mr. *Lawson* says otherwise) is a *Relaxation* or *Dispensation*, so as we shall not be condemned by it. The separating between God's part and our part in this Covenant, never came into Mr. *Lawson's* Mind to see this. We are not on our part (I say) freed from the Law, that we should no longer obey it, or not be liable to Punishment; but we are delivered from it by our Redeemer so as to obtain the Mercy, that God will not deal with us, on his part, according to it.

How then (will you say) does or will he deal with us? I answer, by another Law, which by the Merit of that Satisfaction he also purchased, a Remediating Law, the Law of Grace, the Covenant of Forgiveness, the Law of Faith, in opposition to the Law of Works. The Lord Jesus hath redeemed us, his Poor Lost Creatures, from the Sentence of the Law, by which every Mortal else must have perished, but he takes the *Redeemed* into his hands, and both the *Remediating Law* and *Law of Nature* into his Law (the *Law of Christ*) so that they shall not be *Lawless* for all that. They have the Law still as in the Redeemer's hands, to live by, as well as they can, and as far as *Humane Frailty* will permit;

permit; but they shall be dealt with, in regard to Acceptation, according to the Grace of the Gospel. The Law then remains in the *Precept* and *Threat* as a Rule to *Live by*, but not as the Rule we shall be *Judged by*; a Rule of *Life*, but not of *Judgment*. It is by the Law of *Liberty* we shall be Judged, says St. James: and St. Paul expressly, *According to my Gospel*. Blessed be God for this Truth.

What Mr. *W.* and Mr. *Lobb* will say of this Determination I may know if they write again, but I am not solicitous about that. I am methinks sorry for Mr. *Williams* that he printed his Sheet (when mine alone as a Third Person, to let the World know how little they had against him, how curious the Difference, what need of bearing with one another, had been enough) because he must be forced to agree with me, when he should have differ'd, and is put upon the Defence of a Denial of that which I take to have been advantageous, and the credit of his Books to have owned. It is objected against him, that he holds the Penal Sanction of the Law of Works to be changed. What if he had owned this for his Opinion, and said it is no Error, but stood to it? As Mr. *Baxter* hath his, and I my State of the Point, Mr. *W.* might have his, and we never fall out. Suppose then the Point stated only with two Distinctions: 1. As to the Law, between the *Law it self*, and its *Sanction*. 2. As to the Subjects of this Law, between the *Believer* and *Unbeliever*. Let him then say, the *Law it self* is *unchangeable*, but its *Sanction* is *changed*, and that change to be understood as to *Believers* (for he every where says, the *Unbeliever* is under *Condemnation*;) And let me see who he is will be his Opponent? I say, let me see whether any of our Brethren, out of whose Books Mr. *Lobb* does bring some opposite Sayings to Mr. *W.* (and thereby shifts himself off from being *Accuser* or *Opponent*, so as it is not he, but they, are engaged to make them good) that will undertake to *Oppose*, and Mr. *W.* be *Respondent*? I suppose the Question to be, *Whether the Sanction of the Law be changed*, and held affirmatively, being but thus stated. This I take to be the very ordinarily preached Doctrine by our most Judicious Divines (for to be more exact in *Preaching* may but amuse and hurt the People,) and Mr. *Lobb* does know, and I think Mr. *W.* too, that *trite Determination* I mentioned in my Letter to him, which is co-incidental with what is here said. The Law is to be considered, *qua Fada*, and *qua Regula*. *Qua Regula*, it binds us to perfect Obedience: *Qua Fada*, it binds us to it as the Condition of Life.

Qua

Qua Regula then it remains Obligatory : *Qua Fides* it does not, Christ hath freed us from it.

Let us suppose this to be Mr. *W's* Opinion, and then bring Mr. *Lobb's* Objection. *There is a Change of the Penal Sanction of the Law of Works.* Very well, he grants it. *The Gospel doth not denounce Death for the same Sins, and every Sin, as the Law doth.* Very true, the one follows undeniably from the other. Let us bring then Mr. *W's* Explanation, Comment, or Confirmation of this Opinion. *Though nothing be abated in the Rule of Sin and Duty, yet Blessings are promised to lower degrees of Duty, and a continuance in a State of Death with a bar to the Blessing, are not threatened against every degree of Sin, as the Covenant of Works did.* Can any doubt this to be the Grace of the Gospel-Promise? Doth it promise Life to all Men, however Vile and Impenitent they be? or, Doth it threaten Damnation, or a continuance of it, on any True, Penitent, Believing, Godly Man, because he is imperfect? This change of the Sanction supposeth the Death of Christ, and his honouring the Law by his perfect Obedience; wherein God hath provided for his own Glory, while he promises Life by Forgiveness to imperfect Man, and yet insists on some degree of Obedience, to which of his Grace he enablieth us. What can be spoken more appositely, more judiciously, more roundly to the purpose, and more sufficiently, supposing Mr. *W.* had but held and stood to this Opinion? It is all exactly true, according to the Point thus stated.

I cannot blame Mr. *Lobb* (though I had a mind to do it) to think that this was indeed Mr. *W's* Opinion, because his Discourse loses its current upon a contrary Supposition. Mr. *Lobb* shews himself a more piercing Man than I thought upon that account. I will turn therefore to another place, *Gospel Truth*, p. 115. Dr. *Crisp* oft tells us, that the Sanction of the Law of Works is removed, and the Curse gone; as to the Elect: This is true, if he mean that sinless Obedience is not now the way of Life, and all below it shall not bind Death upon us, so as to hinder our Relief by the Gospel. Here Mr. *Lobb* shews me in a Letter that Mr. *W.* grants, expressly, that the Sanction of the Law is removed: *It is true*, that is, he confesses it. Very good, all consonant to himself. It is true in this meaning, which he sets forth just in the Sense (I say) the Point is stated. By the way let Mr. *Lobb* note, that when Mr. *W.* says, *It is true in this meaning*, it implies that if it be meant otherwise, *It is not true*, which answers the Quotation.

By this it appears how well, thoroughly well, as would have been, if he had maintained, not denied the Charge of his Brethren.

thren. Hear therefore a little more amply Mr. George Lawson (with whom neither Mr. W. Mr. Lobb, nor I, are to be compared) for a Conclusion. *There is one great Change in respect to the Law. Perfect Obedience to it was first made the Condition of Life; but afterwards that Promise of Life upon those strict Terms, and that severe Commination of Death upon Sin were abolished, and Faith was made the only Condition of Life: So that it may be truly said, that the Law of Works is abrogated, but not the Moral Law considered by it self.*

I would have therefore Mr. W. methinks here ask the Brethren to give him his hand in again, or if he thinks good he may take it: If not, let us come to the Question waved hitherto. *Is a Change of the Penal Sanction of the Moral Law, the same as, The Gospel hath another Sanction to the Preceptive part of the Law?* For answering which Question, by the *Sanction of the Law*, I understand the Penalty under which the Duty is required, and so does Mr. Lobb, because when Mr. W. says *Sanction*, he cites *Penal Sanction*, supposing, as here spoken, nothing else by it but the *Penalty*. Now then when Mr. W. says, *The Gospel hath another Sanction* (or, *a Change of the Sanction*) to the *Preceptive part of the Law*, Mr. Lobb accounts he must be understood to mean, That the Precepts of the Law being taken into the Gospel, are not required under that Penalty as they were in the Covenant of Works, and thereupon does collect this as his Error. The Collection is Rational, but Mr. W. denies this to be his meaning. Every Sin out of doubt does deserve Death, even in the Believer, and therefore the perfect Duty of the Law, is required by the Gospel, under the same Penalty, though that Penalty is remitted (being not remediless, as under the Law it was) upon the other Terms of it. Christ's Law comprehends (I have said) the *Law of Nature*, and the *Remedying Law both*. When the *Law of Nature* therefore remaineth, it must make the *Punishment* due; but the *Pardoning Law* being conjunct with it, makes the *Impunity* due also: *In primo instanti*, the Punishment; *in secundo*, Impunity.

It is necessary therefore, I judge, for Mr. W. to explain his Term *Sanction*, and try if he can make his words so intelligible, as one may say he gave no occasion of Mis-construction: But seeing by this Phrase of his (as I call it in Mr. Lobbs Sheets) and much more by that Mr. Lobb hath added from another place [*The Gospel doth not denounce Death for the same, and every Sin, as Adam's Law did.*] there is occasion given to Mr. Lobb to believe him herein in an Error (if it be one, and the contrary be not,) and
rationally

rationally to do so, I must, in my Judgment on the case, so far excuse Mr. Lobb.

Let us consider again, The words of Mr. W. may be construed, either with Application of his Readers Thoughts to the Law alone, or to the Gospel alone, or to the Law and Gospel both together. If the Readers Thoughts be applied to the Law alone, then *Another Sanction* being the same with a *Change of the Sanction*, and that upon Christ's Satisfaction too, he must needs understand the meaning to be, that the Penal Sanction of the Law is by the Gospel, or by Christ's Death and Obedience, made void; for the same Law cannot have two Sanctions, and if its own be changed, it is abolished. If the Readers Thoughts be applied to the Gospel alone, they must recur, for there is no change of Sanction questionable as to that. If his Reader construe him with Application of his Thoughts to Law and Gospel both together, then may the meaning indeed be understood, that the *Gospel Sanction* is changed from that which was the *Law Sanction*, so as to be *another* and not the same, without making void one or the other, which yet is a perplext Conception. Now of these three Applications of a Man's Thoughts to the words (if one did not know that the last was the Author's meaning because he says so) the first Application I think likeliest to fall into the Thoughts of another Man as well as Mr. Lobb's, rather than either of the other. So far is he farther to be excused.

On the other side, when I come to look into Mr. W's Books, and see with my Eyes what he hath said, I may excuse Mr. Lobb in a mistake of Judgment (if he do mistake,) but do not, till farther Scrutiny, clear him from wronging Mr. W. I will turn to his last Book first, *Man made Righteous*, p. 106. *There is hardly a Truth more plain in the Word of God, than that the Wrath of God abides still upon Unbelievers, notwithstanding Christ's Death.* Mr. Lobb says, he holds the Penal Sanction of the Law abrogated, and how does this place stare in Mr. Lobb's Face? I will turn next to his middle Book, *Defence of Gospel Truth*, p. 2. *That Men while they reject the Gospel, are not at all under the Curse of the Law, I abhor.* How any should be under the Curse of the Law, and the Penal Sanction of it be not of Force, I never yet had one thought. Let us look then last into his first Book from whence the Exception was gathered, *Gospel Truth*, p. 5. *That the Elect, while Dead in Sin and Unbelief, are Children of Wrath, and condemned by the Law, I affirm.* Again, p. 107. *The Gospel denounceth and declareth all condemned till*

they believe. It declares they are so, and denounceth they shall be so. John 3. 36. He that believeth not on the Son, shall not see Life, but the Wrath of God abideth on him. And v. 18. He that believeth not, is condemned already. Here is the case of all men by the Fall, they are condemned and under Wrath: Here is the way of Relief, a Christ believed on, and they that believe their Condemnation is reversed.

These places at the reading moved me much, and made me write to Mr. Lobb, but I found him aware of such Passages, and not moved, answering that for all these words, Mr. W. meant them only of the Gospel Denunciation. Mr. W's Opinion he accounts was, that Christ by his Death hath taken away the Curse of the Law; and the Curse-the Unbeliever is under, is only that of the Gospel, *He that believeth not shall be Damned*. To this purpose may be observed those picked Terms of *Governing Justice*, and *Governing Grace*, which Mr. W. uses as equivalent to the two Governments of Mr. Lawson (the Creator's Government, and the Redeemer's Government) which must be supposed to have their two *Laws*, the *New* vacating the *Old*. As also those Arguments Mr. W. offers to prove a new Law, that do notable fit a Judgment so possess: *What kind of Government can we assign to Christ (says he) if there be no Sanction to his Law?* But if he hold the Sanction of the *Old Law* (as taken into Christ's) to stand good, I pray why such a Necessity of it to the *New*.

Nevertheless the words of Mr. W. as I have quoted them, are so exprels, for all Men by the Fall to be under the Curse (which does imply the Law therefore to be of force) that I cannot give Judgment upon any such bare Reasoning. Let us therefore see another place Mr. Lobb points me to, *Defence of Gospel Truth*, p. 23. *Adam's Law must be altered by the Law-giver to admit of Satisfaction*. Here, says Mr. Lobb, is plain proof of Mr. W's holding the Law changed: But (though the word *altered* be unskilfully said, and he should say *relaxed*) that which follows in three lines after, to wit, [*The Sentence that condemned Adam, seizes on all Men as soon as they have being, there needs no other.*] does again turn the Scale for Mr. W.

The Truth is, the words I am to judge of between these two Brethren, are in Mr. W's first Book, and it is that alone must shew what was his mind then. The Passages for him I have mentioned, are not so positively fixt in that Book, as in the two other, after he was warned. And there are two places not mentioned by Mr. Lobb, but observed by me in reading the Book afresh

affresh quite over, that do put me to a stand. One is p. 221. where he hath words to this sense, *We are not to preach the Sanction of the Law of Innocency, but may press the Gospel Sanction.* The other is in the exprefs words, *Is it the Grace of God to leave his Precepts without any Sanction, when he removed the Curse of the Law?* Here is the Curse of the Law, that is, the *Penal Sanction* removed, that is, *changed*, and another brought into its room, as being that (it is like he meant) which lies on all till they believe. There is nothing goes before or after to alieviate this sense, P. 242.

I must needs say here therefore, that I was sorry to see this place, because I had come to a Judgment and finished my Sheets, and was brought to this pass within my self. Mr. Lobb (I reasoned) does verily believe that Mr. W's Opinion was as he notifies it to be: Mr. W. that knows what his own mind was, better than any, complains that he mistakes, and wrongs him. On one side I accounted, here is *Confidence*, but on the other *Knowledge*. I had passed therefore this Judgment, that Mr. Lobb was to be *Excused*, but Mr. W. *Acquitted*. There is *Obscurity* not *Error* I had thought in the words of Mr. W. there is *Mistake* not *Malice* in the Collection of Mr. Lobb. But now I cannot (I must confess) in Point of Conscience let this go. I cannot say there is *Mistake* herein, but rather *Sagacity* in Mr. Lobb, and I cannot say there is no Error of Mr. W. herein, but rather that he was one then not come to any Consistency about the Point, and that it is best for him to be in Suspense still, seeing that which we three suppose to be the *Error*, some others more weighty than we take to be *Truth*. *If the Moral Law* (said such a one) *should be in force as it was to Adam, no Man upon one Act of Disobedience could be saved: Therefore that manner of Strict Obligation ceaseth unto sinful Man for ever.*

This being so, that, what Mr. W's Opinion was at his first Writing, I am not sure; insomuch as I can bring in no *Billa vera*, but an *Ignoramus* in my last Verdict to the Brethren, that are some time to meet about it: And that it is like his Opinion was not then so digested as that himself can tell it: Nay, that it is no matter, or very little matter, whether his Opinion was so or otherwise, seeing the Opinion *Pro* or *Con* may be good enough, at least inoffensive either of them, if but stated well: Nay yet, that it may be peradventure in other Differences between our Brethren, no otherwise than so as it is in this, I must come to that Conclusion at last, which I came to long since, and stand to it, that it is not upon a Union in Opinion, or upon certain Theses
drawn

drawn up into such a Latitude of Words as all may subscribe, but upon a Union in forbearing and bearing with one another in all things but what is of necessity to Salvation; that our Concord must be re-established.

PART II.

I Have done here with the Arbitration which I count *Mr. W.* and *Mr. Lobb* appointed me, that is, as to this particular matter, and as for any other Points between them, they are not my Province: Only so far as the *Middle Doctrine of Justification*, which I maintain is concerned, I cannot but take notice how one word, and that *ἀπαξ ἀντιπροσώπου*, used but once in one place, is the ground almost of all their Dissention. It is the word *Surety*, Heb. 7. 22. This word hath been so strained, or rather grossly taken, not only by the *Antinomian* but our Divines ordinarily, as if Christ were such a Surety for us in the Covenant of Works, as bound with us in the same Bond (so coarse is their Speech,) insomuch as when he performed the Duty, and suffered the Penalty in our behalf, they reckon it done in our Persons, so that God looks on the Believer (in Law sense) as having perfectly obeyed and suffered in his Surety, and consequently that he receiving this Righteousness (or making it his) by Faith, does stand justified in that Righteousness of Christ by the Law of Works. If *Mr. Lobb*, or any Brother, (it is all alike who they be) hath used words to this Sense, they must be rectified. *Mr. W.* is not to come to them, but they to *Mr. W.* They do heinously err (says *Mr. Baxter*) and subvert the Gospel, who says that Christ's Righteousness is so imputed to us, as that God reputeth Christ to have been perfectly Holy, and suffered, though not in our Natural yet in the Legal or Civil Person of the Sinner, or Believer, as their *Strict* and proper Representer, and so to have our selves fulfilled all Righteousness in him, or by him, and thereby be Justified. There are more words by way of Aggravation which I fill up with [and thereby be Justified] because they tend only to shew what the allowing so much at the beginning does draw after it.

This Doctrine I have said is coarse, I add, and grounded on a Mistake, which I have inculcated in my Book of *Justification*.
Divines

Divines indeed ordinarily, Papists and Protestants, supposing that it is by the *Law*, the *Law of Works*, that we shall be *Judged*, do fall out, and must fall out one *against*, and one *with* another : But let them reflect, and understand aright, that it is not the *Law of Works*, but the *Law of Grace*, or *Law of Faith*, not the *Law* but the *Gospel* (*Rom. 1. 16. James 2. 12. before noted*) is and shall be the *Rule of Judgment* (when the *Law* is indeed the *Rule of Living*.) they must end the Quarrel between most of them. Upon this * account, when the Protestant judges that we must have a Righteousness that answers the *Law* (as his,) or else he cannot at all be justified, he does make Christ such a *Surety*, and devise such a *Commutation of Persons* as suits to that Conception : But he that is clear, as to the *Rule* by which we shall be judged, will be contented with such a *Suretyship* and *Commutation* only, as the *Scripture* (I was upon saying as *Mr. W.*) does allow him.

For *Christ's Suretyship* in the first place, I do not fancy so much to be made of it even as *Mr. W.* does. That he was a *Surety* on God's part, and then on our part—and I know not what. The true and faithful God I hope has no need of any *Surety* on his part to make *His* good, I count that but idle he says to excuse it : And if Christ was a strict proper (in humane sense proper) *Surety* of the new Covenant on our part to make *Ours* good, then must all of us be saved, because the Gospel Covenant (I hold) is *Universal*, and not made with the *Elect* only. That which I conceive then, as to Christ's *Suretyship*, is, that he was to do, and did, all that was to be done for Satisfaction to God in our behalf, for procuring the Gospel-Covenant for the lost World. This I apprehend to be the main of the business. *There is one Mediator* (which is the common Appellation of the same import as *Surety*) *between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a Ransome for all to be testified in due time.* 2 Tim. 2. 5, 6. Christ was a *Surety*, but a *Surety* in the *Scripture Sense*, not in an *Arbitrary Sense*. Christ was a *Surety*,

*Hence *Contaremus*, though a *Papist* and a *Cardinal*, who defines also *Justificari* to be *justum fieri, & propterea justum haberi*, hath yet these words. *Ego prorsus existimo piè & Christianè dici, quod debeamus niti justitia Christi nobis donata, non autem gratia nobis inherente. Hæc enim justitia nostra est inchoata & imperfecta, qua tueri nos non potest quin in multis offendamus. Idcirco in conspectu Dei non possumus ob hanc justitiam nostram haberi justî & boni : Sed justitia Christi nobis donata est perfecta qua omnino placet oculis Dei. Hæc ergo sola certa & stabili nitendum est, & ob eam solum credere nos justificari coram Deo, id est justos haberi, & dici justos.* Cont. de Justificatione.

not

not in an *Antinomian* Sense, but in a Sense which must be agreeable to every thing else that is said of him in Scripture. This is safe, and this is true, and here I will stand by Mr. *W.* But whether Christ's *Suretyship* is to be made commensurate with his *Priesthood*, to make good his, or any others Notion of it, I question. It is no where said we have a *Surety* (though a *Highb Priest* and *Intercessor*) now in Heaven.

As for the *Commutation* in the next place then of *Persons*, I acknowledge such a one accordingly, as is necessary to the *Impetration* of our Redemption, but I understand none so as to go into the *Application*. Christ took on him our Flesh, made Satisfaction in our stead, and procured an Act of Grace or Pardon for all : But there is no *Commutation* I know as to particular Persons in the Point of *Justification*. If Christ made an exchange of his Righteousness with *Peter* for his Sins, any otherwise than as to the Impetration of Pardon on condition that concerns all alike, then Christ's Righteousness must now be *Peter's*, and *James* and *John* could never have it. In Christ's uniting himself to us, by his taking our Nature, Obeying, Suffering, satisfying God's Justice, I acknowledge a *Commutation*, even such, to wit, that our Sins were so imputed to him, as that he died for them, and in our stead, (understanding the Phrases aright) and his Righteousness so imputed, as to be the Cause that upon our believing we enjoy the Benefit : But in Christ's uniting us to him, by giving his Spirit to work in us that Condition whereby we have our Right to the Benefit, there is nothing done by him in our stead, nothing by us in his, no new, no other, no farther Imputation. The Fruit of his Purchase (Pardon and Salvation by a Law of Grace) cannot be *formaliter* his, and if that he communicates to us be not his, how is there a *Commutation* ? Of this Sacrifice and Righteousness it self we are incapable : Of the Effect or Fruits Christ is incapable. What he hath not, he cannot communicate ; what he hath, we cannot receive. It is true, he hath received *potestatem conferendi*, and in that respect, *eminenter*, may be said to receive for us his own Benefits ; but for us then must be only *bono nostro*, if it were *loco nostro*, our selves could not have them. The Punishment we deserved Christ bare *loco nostro*, therefore we are not to bear it : The Benefits Christ purchased we have, therefore *loco nostro* he could not receive them. There is, there can be, no Substitution of Person in our partaking the Benefits purchased, as there was, there must be, in the purchasing them for us.

There

There is a Chapter on this Head in my Book, called, *Peaceable Disquisitions*, I refer thither for farther Explication:

With Mr. W. I believe (speaking strictly) that Christ was no Surety of the Covenant of Works, so as to enter into the same Bond before or after (it were but trifling to make a Dispute of that) it was forfeited: And that his Reasons for it are good, his fourth especially, as to the ill Consequences following upon it. Against Mr. W. I apprehend Christ to be no Surety neither, of the Covenant of Grace in a strict proper Sense (as I say also in my Sheet) because the business of this Suretiship I said now, does lye mainly in obtaining for us this Covenant (as Moses dealt in his Mediatorship,) and not in the undertaking on God's part (which needs not) and on our part, that it should be kept. In this sense do I understand the Prophet, when God says, he will give Christ for a Covenant of the People, that is, to mediate this Covenant, to procure it. The word *Surety*, I say again, must be taken in such a Sense (and not any other) which agrees with every thing else said of Christ in the Scripture, or with the whole Doctrine of the Gospel besides: And that Doctrine is false (I count) which confines the Gospel-Covenant to the Elect. Not that he undertook that all be mediated for, should do all that is their Duty, says the thoroughly Understanding Mr. Baxter, in his Paraphrase on the place.

As for Mr. W. I will take leave to say, he is to me a considerable Man, especially as to his Talent, Elocution; which yet, unless his Judgment also be Good, Staid and Unpassionate, as it appears, may prove to him a Temptation. There is nothing I distrust him so much in, as in his Distinctions, which I cannot but suspect sometimes (through his Facility of words,) to be made rather in diverse Expressions, than in the reality of the things he would distinguish. I am afraid least he should hereby come to yield more in our main Cause, than we can again recover. This appears more particularly in these two Points, wherein I am more particularly concerned, the Conditionality of the Covenant, and the Business of *Justification*.

It is to be known and acknowledged, there are several places in the Old Testament, which speak of God's Circumcising the Heart, giving a new one, putting his Fear into it; so as they that have this Promise fulfilled to them, shall enter into Covenant with God in Sincerity, and never again depart from him: Upon which account it is called an *Everlasting Covenant*, and a *second Covenant*

in Opposition to the first that the *Israelites* brake, as it is in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. In these places then we have a Promise (for they are all I suppose in the account of most one and the same Promise) which is an Absolute Promise, that is, to give that which hath no Condition required of us for the obtaining it, the first Grace, the new Heart, Faith and Repentance, in order to our Salvation. Now the Promise being Absolute, and called the Covenant, [*This is my Covenant I will make with the House of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my Laws into their Minds, and write them in their Hearts: And I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a People,*] the Antinomian does apprehend it to be the Covenant of Grace, and that the Covenant of Grace therefore is not Conditional, for there is no Condition in this Promise, and if that we call the Condition, is on God's part given, and not required as a Condition to be performed on our parts, the Covenant is without Condition.

Here now the *Orthodox Calvinist*, who is neither *Arminian* or *Antinomian*, are of two sorts, one whose Genius carries them so much against *Arminianism*, that they come as near as they can to the *Antinomian*: And the other whose Genius leads them so far from *Antinomianism*, that they come as near as they can to the *Arminian*; but either of them carefully avoiding the Danger of both Errors. Under the first sort I must rank Mr. Cole and Mr. Mather, and such as will say here (with Mr. Rutherford) that this Promise is part of the Covenant of Grace (not the whole Covenant,) and that this Promise of Faith, or the first Grace, being part of the Covenant-Blessings, and the Fruit of Christ's Purchase for the Elect, the Covenant in this respect is without any Antecedent Condition: But the first Grace being given in order to obtain farther Blessings, that first Grace (I suppose in their account) is a Consequent Condition (in regard to the Connexion between them) to those Benefits, and so save they themselves from *Antinomianism*. Under the Latter sort, I had thought I might have ranked Mr. W. with my self, but I will name one more worthy than we, for his most acute and strong parts, Mr. Woodbridge, who does deny this Promise to be part of the Covenant of Grace made with Fallen Man: But that it is either an indefinite Promise, which God will make good on whom he pleases in their use of means, or a Promise in regard to the Elect, not made to them, but made to Christ in the Covenant of Redemption (if we may frame such a thing in God's Decrees) as it is distinguished

tinguished from that made with *Man*, or Gospel-Covenant, which requires Faith and Repentance (wrought in us by God's first Grace) as the Condition, and upon that Condition, and that as performed by us (though through that Grace) does grant us Remission and Eternal Life. And this first Grace God gives to this end, that his *Elect* may in their time enter this Covenant, and so have the benefits of it.

I signified this to Mr. *W.* in my Sheet, but he (in his) is so full of himself, as he will take his Friends by the halves. *I never wrote* (says he) *that Faith and Repentance are not Covenant-Blessings*: Put Mr. *Lobb* I perceive thought, and so do I, that this is consonant to what he should write. No Man can have any *Benefit* of the Covenant that is not in Covenant. That which is given of God to his *Elect*, as pre-requisite to enter Covenant, is given them before they are in Covenant, and therefore is not any of the Benefits of it. This is what I meant, and I for my part therefore do say, that Faith and Repentance are the *Conditions* and not the *Benefits* of the Gospel-Covenant. For if they be granted Blessings thereof, then is there no Condition to its Benefits, and so the Covenant is not Conditional according to the sense of those that oppose us. The Benefits of the Covenant are God's part to perform, and if Faith and Repentance were part of those Benefits, it were well indeed for us, for then must all within the Church be saved: The Minister does on God's part declare the Covenant in his Preaching the Word, and *Seals* it in delivery of the Sacraments, and that to every one: If every one therefore hath not this Faith and Repentance given him, either this Faith and Repentance is not indeed one of the *Benefits*, or God is not Faithful in Covenant (this Universal Gospel-Covenant) which cannot be argued, but with a reverential Aversion.

He hath one thing a little higher to the same effect. *Sir, you omit one part of the Objection, that I should say the Conditions are Legal. I never called them so: I give five Instances of the difference between the Condition of the Covenant of Works, and Grace.* Here is our Cause yielding still, but I must beg his Pardon, for he says in this he knows not what. The Instances he mentions are nothing to the purpose: And as he said before, he never wrote that Faith and Repentance are not Benefits of the Covenant, when he should have wrote so: So he says here, he never called them Legal Conditions, when he needed not scruple it. Mr. *Lobb* put in the word *Legal* in opposition only to *Testamentary*; and when he

grants a Testamentary Condition, *he does*, I count, under a more lost word, ingenuously grant us our Point. It is in Mr. Lobb's *Peaceable Enquiry*, which Mr. W. it seems knows not. To Mr. Lobb then I say, If I have an Estate given me by Will or Testament upon a certain Condition, I must perform that Condition; or else I cannot have that Estate though it be Gift: But the Condition being performed, it gives me Right to that Estate by that Testament, and the Law will make it good. It is so as to a *Promise*, and as to the *Covenant*. The *Performance* gives us Right by (not its own Merit, but virtue of) that *Promise*, that *Covenant*. This I affirm (says Mr. W. himself) *the Promise conveys the Title as soon as the Terms of the Grant are answered*, Gospel Truth, p. 61. That thing which being performed gives Right to the Benefit, is a true legal Condition in Mr. Lobb's sense. There is nothing else to be understood by it. *Legal* is not opposed here to *Evangelical* but to *Not rightful*. As I said therefore but now, that Faith and Repentance are not the *Benefits*, but the *Conditions* of the Gospel-Covenant: So say I they are *Antecedent, legal* (Evangelically legal, legal in the sense of Mr. Lobb's seeming denial thereof) *Conditions* of those *Benefits*. And this I did not omit, as Mr. W. thinks, but did *de industria* own it in my Sheet in these words. *If we do not make Faith such a Condition as Antecedes the Benefits, and that being performed gives right to them, that we may not mince the matter (whereby I meant the aforelaid distinction) it is but trifling to maintain that the Covenant hath any Conditions.* If we confess our Sins, God is Just and Faithful to forgive them. They have right to the Tree of Life that keep his Commandments.

To return then now to the new Heart, promised in the Prophets to the House of Israel, *when the days come* that they may enter this Covenant so as to break it no more, I have one thing to offer here to publick consideration. Our Divines interpret these Texts to belong to the Elect, to them only, all the Elect, (with whom this Covenant is made from Eternity in Christ, say some, supposing *Thú*, and the *Covenant of Redemption* to be one.) Now it is to me a question whether they be not quite out, because it is manifest in all the places in the *Prophecs*, and that to the *Hebrews*, that this Promise and Covenant to be made, is peculiar still to the Jews, and that confined to a certain time (*Behold the days come, saith the Lord*) which is expressed over and over after their scattering and recollection. Let us look the Scripture. The first Text that we have, wherein this Absolute promise

Promise is to be found, is in *Deut. 30. 6.* *And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy Seed.* Well, but when will the Lord do this? They were almost all uncircumcised in Heart at present, and continued so during their Judges, their Kings, and Prophets. Look therefore to the Verses before, and *Moses* is Prophecying of their State hereafter, that they would Sin and God would scatter them, and then gather them after from all Nations, and bring them to the Land *which their Fathers possessed* (speaking this before they came into Possession) and in that State it is he promises this Circumcision of their Heart, so as they shall love him with the whole of it, and live, and fall no more from him.

Let us come from *Moses* to the Prophets, see *Ezek. 11. 19, 20.* *I will give them one heart, and put a new Spirit in them, and I will take away the stony heart that they may walk in my Ordinances, and they shall be my People, and I will be their God.* Here is the Promise, but to whom? Why all the whole House of Israel wholly are they, v. 15. Even the scattered afar off among the Countries, v. 16. And when is it to be fulfilled? *I will gather you from the People, and assemble you out of the Countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the Land of Israel, v. 17.* Likewise in *Chap. 36. v. 22. to 28.* Say to the House of Israel, O House of Israel, *I will take you from among the Heathen, and gather you from all Countries, and will bring you to your own Land. Then will I sprinkle clean water on you, and a new Spirit, and take away the heart of stone, and cause you to walk in my Statutes, and ye shall be my People, and I will be your God.* From *Ezekiel* let us go to *Jeremiah*, *Jer. 32. 37.* *I will gather them, (the Children of Israel and Judah, v. 30.) out of all Countries whither I have driven them in my Anger, and bring them again to this place; I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever. And I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, and they shall not depart from me.* In *Hos. 2.* *And it shall be at that day thou shalt call me Ishi, v. 16.* And in that day I will make a Covenant, v. 18. And I will betroth thee for ever, v. 19. And it shall come to pass in that day I will bear, v. 21. Well! and when is that day? Look *Jer. 16. 14, 15:* *Behold, the dayes come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said, the Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of Egypt: But the Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel from the Land of the North, and from all Lands whither he had driven them: And I will bring them again into their Land that I gave their Fathers.* Thus much is apparent, that whensoever

Toever this new Heart and new Covenant is promised, it is peculiar to the Jews upon a Restauration. Let us look lastly then into the *Hebrews*, which cites another Text out of *Jeremiab*, Heb. 8. 8. *Finding faults with them* (in regard to the first Covenant) *he saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new Covenant with the House of Israel, and the House of Judah: Not according to that I made with their Fathers in the day that I lead them out of Egypt, because they continued not in it, and I regarded them not.* And so goes on to what I have cited in the beginning, and more follows to the end.

Here is a Covenant we see made with the Jews, which they brake, and God casts them off; and here is another which he promises to be made with them, that they shall keep, and he will cast them off no more; and this time it shall be made with them, is when he shall gather them from all parts of the World where they are scattered, and bring them to their Land again, as it is in all the places here mentioned. *At that time, In that day, he will give them this new Heart to enter this new Covenant* (this second Covenant, and *with them*, not the second with Mankind, which was with us in *Adam* Fallen) *after those days, saith the Lord.* And when was that day? Is it past? Was it not immediately after the Captivity out of *Babylon*? I judge not, for the Jews that returned then, were those of *Judah* only, not the scattered of the whole House of *Israel*; and these also in some time grew as bad as their Forefathers, *filling up their measure*, as *Christ* speaks, inso-much as they came to Crucifie the Lord of Life himself; and there is no Season yet, wherein such a Heart hath been given them, as in these Texts is promised, that they should so Covenant, as to break it no more. This is certain, that since their Sin in Crucifying *Christ*, they have been driven from *Jewry* and dispersed the World over; and the Promise then of gathering them out of all Nations, and giving them this new Heart, thus to Covenant a new (or a second time) with the Lord, is in all likelihood not yet, nor to be accomplished, *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*, as *Christ* tells, *Luke* 21. 24. And *St. Paul* Comments it, *Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come*, *Rom.* 11. 25.

That there is a time of *Calling the Jews*, is not only an ancient Opinion of *Justin Martyr*, and many of those Fathers that were *Millenaries*; but of our *Orthodox Divines*; and it was much upon the Hearts of those called *Puritans* in their time, it being built on those two Texts now mentioned: And indeed there are
twenty

twenty and twenty places in the Prophets, that speak of a glorious State of the Jews to come, that none can say have yet their Accomplishment. And if this Opinion of a time to come of *Calling the Jews* be good, then may we well believe that *that* will be the time when these Texts, and Promise stood upon, will be fulfilled. When the Conversion of the Gentiles is brought in to the full of what God has determined (to whom a *thousand years is but as one day*) then shall be the gathering of the scattered. And as it is into the *Jews Olive* the *Gentiles* are ingrafted, the *Jews* shall return to that *Olive* themselves, and both become the Church of Christ: So that *All Israel shall be saved*, says the Apostle, citing for it that of *Isaiab*, *There shall come out of Sion a Deliverer, and shall turn away Ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my Covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins*; Rom. 11. 26. Note it, the Covenant, called the *new Covenant* in the *Hebrews*, is to be made with *Jacob*, that is, his Posterity, at this time when this Prophecy is accomplished, and that is plainly at the *calling of the Jews*.

Now then from what is said I argue, and by virtue of all these Scriptures forecited, I do deny that the first Grace, Faith and Repentance, or the new Heart, is a Promise of the Covenant of Grace made with Mankind, or with the Elect in Christ, because it is a Promise only to the *Jews*, and to come, and that at such a time, when hereafter God shall gather them into his Church from among the Nations.

It may be objected, That the very mentioning the Prophecy of *Jeremiah* by the Author to the *Hebrews*, does prove it to be applied to his times (it does prove it indeed not to be in any time before, and so not at their return from *Babylon*) and that the mentioning that Covenant, does prove it to be meant of the Gospel-Covenant: But I deny it. The mentioning of a Promise made only to the *Jews*, is no proof of it to be made to *all the Elect*; and the mention of a Covenant to be made with them *after those days*, is no proof that it is meant of a Covenant made with us at the *present day*. He does not say as Christ did, when he opened the Book at a place prophecying of him, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your Ears*, for the day is not yet come, the day of God's making this second Covenant with the Jews (for I must inculcate that it is a *second* as to them) only the Author cites the Prophecy in respect to his matter in hand, which is, that the Jewish Dispensation, their *Priesthood* and *Covenant*, was already ceased,

ceased, the Promise of a *new* to come, shewing its intended Abolishment: Which arguing is good, and becoming Sacred Scripture, though the time be to come. For there's nothing here argued but at present is true, notwithstanding the *peculiarity* of this Prophecy is yet to be made good. The Covenant of Grace in the *Substance* of it, is one and the same since *Adam's* Fall to this day, and to this time yet to be accomplished: But the diverse *Administrations* of it were to be at several Seasons. It was in the *Promise* only till Christ, and then he *ratified* it by his Blood, and *promulgated* it by his Apostles, which all stands good very consistently with another *Administration* (as to them) upon the *Jews* Vocation.

I know now there are twenty Questions might be raised here by way of Objection, or for the sake of Elucidation, which I was a little thinking upon, but I will leave them every one to others Meditations. If what I have started be good, there is an end of all Difficulty in regard to the *Conditionality* of the *Gospel-Covenant*, and what I or others have answered to those Texts may be spared: For there is nothing considerable but from these Texts that is against us. I conclude, If it be good, there is some body or other, at some time or other, will make it good: If it be not good, I will be at my liberty to stand where I do, and disbelieve it again as well as any other.

P A R T I I I .

IN the Point of Justification Mr. *W.* made this grant, and presuming upon it in this Paper, he tells me, *I have truly represented his words*, to wit, that *Besides the Effects being made ours, the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed to Believers*, though I told him, (*Mid. way of Just.* p. 56.) that this (as far as I can see) is to boggle, and yield our Cause to his Adversaries. It is in vain really (if it be not sinful daubing to be bewailed in the consequence of it) for Mr. *W.* to argue against Christ's Suretiship, and *Commutation of Persons* in the ill sense, which he intends only to confute, when that ill sense, and all that the *Antinomian* says besides depends on this Supposition, that Christ's Righteousness is made ours more, or otherwise, than in the Effects. For my part therefore, I do plainly here, as plainly before, say, that if our Divines will have any other Imputation of Christ's Righteousness than

than *quoad fructus & effectus*, they must for me have none at all. For when the Phrase, of the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, is not once found in Scripture, it must be *gratis* allowed them; and if they will not accept this, I can allow no more.

To open my self, The common Opinion of Protestants is, that we are Justified by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and that this Righteousness is imputed so, as God does reckon Christ's Righteousness for ours, that it may answer the Law of Works, according to which they conceive we are to be Justified. As the Scripture says Faith is imputed for Righteousness, so do they think Christ's Righteousness is: For they understand Faith *Objectivè in sensu correlativo*, for Christ's Righteousness received by Faith: When the Scripture says no where that his Righteousness is imputed (as I noted but now,) and much less that it is *imputed for Righteousness*, there being no good Sense thereof which is like to hold.

Of these Divines, some and the most do understand by Christ's Righteousness, the Righteousness of his Life and Death, his Active and Passive Obedience both. God does reckon us (say they) to have suffered the Penalty of the Law in his Death, and so we are free from Condemnation: And being *Reli in curia*, there is required farther a Righteousness of perfect Obedience to this Law for a Right to Heaven, and so his Active Obedience is imputed also.

Others being convinced of a manifest Inconsistency here (seeing if the *Active Obedience* of Christ be imputed to us, which is to reckon us, that we have neither omitted any Duty, nor committed any Sin, there needs no Imputation of his *Sufferings*;) they maintain that Christ's Active Obedience was *Justitia Personæ*, a Righteousness necessary to himself as a Man to fulfil: But his Passive (seeing he was Sinless) was, and must be for us only, and in our stead, and that is the *Justitia meriti* which is imputed to Sinners for their Justification. It is the choicest of our Protestant Divines beyond Sea, next *Luther* and *Calvin*, that go this way.

But there have been some more pondering Thoughts on this Doctrine of *Imputation*, by such as apprehend, that as the Righteousness of Christ being an Accident inhering in him as its proper Subject, and incapable to be in us also, so neither can it be *in se imputed* to us, or reckoned so as ours, whether it be the Righteousness of his Life or Death. To be accounted of God to be as

Righteous as Christ himself, is too hard of Digestion, and therefore they will allow an Imputation, but understand it sensibly, that Christ's Righteousness is indeed *imputed* to Believers, but not *in se* as ours in it self, but so as to be ours only in the Fruits and Effects. Thus that masterfully learned Man *Forbes* in his *Modest questions*, and some others: Which giving Mr. Baxter the Notion, he hath so cultivated it, delivering his Judgment that way, and that in so many Books, and so largely, as it is hard for any to gainsay, or to say that he does fully comprehend him.

He hath prudently used *Bradshaw* as to the making up Christ's Satisfaction of both Obediences Active and Passive, according to that Mediatorial Covenant (as we speak of it) between his Father and him. For this was the Father's Pleasure or Mediatorial Command (*This Commandment I received of my Father*) that he should repair the Honour of his broken Law, and answer the ends of it, by a perfect obeying of it, and suffering for Man's Sin against it, and thereby Merit to all Mankind (it being done in their behalf) a Right to Pardon and Salvation, or to Impunity and Life; which yet is to be given them upon such Terms as should please him and the Redeemer; for so long as it was not the Persons themselves that obeyed and suffered, but another in their stead, (and that by way of *Satisfaction* not *strict Payment*,) the Benefit of that Obedience and Suffering might be disposed at their Will. Now this Right to Impunity and Life obtained, is given or granted in an Act of Grace, declared in the Gospel, which runs thus, that whosoever he be that Believes, Repents, and lives sincerely according to it, shall be pardoned and saved.

Even as in an Act of Pardon by Parliament, a Man hath committed Treason or the like, the Treason is still by the Law Death, but upon such an Act passing, those Persons that are guilty are pardoned, if qualified according to the Act: In like manner that Man who performs this Gospel-Condition, hath this Right by vertue of this Act, Law (or Covenant) of Grace, Grant, Deed of Gift, Will of Christ, Testament, or Gospel. The Righteousness of Christ is the Meritorious Cause of it, and this Act of Grace, the Instrument of Donation, or Law-title.

Here then we see is a Righteousness Evangelical that we have and must have, and here is a Right to Impunity and Life (which you may if you will call a Righteousness too) that we have also: But the Righteousness of Christ we have here only in the Effect.

As

As in the common instance, I have a Friend made Slave in *Algiers*, I give a 100 *l.* for his Ransom, he never has, nor sees the 100 *l.* but the Money is his in the Liberty he possesseth.

Note, When the former sort of Divines mentioned say, that by the Imputation of Christ's Death to us, we become *recti in Curia*, and there must be then a Righteousness of his Life imputed farther, to entitle us to Heaven, they understand still that it is by the *Law of Works* that we are to be tried and judged: But let all understand aright (as before) that it is by the *Law of Grace*, and supposing then we were thereby *recti in curia*, that Righteousness required farther unto this Title, must be the Righteousness of that Law we are judged by, to wit, our Evangelical Righteousness only, which is accepted unto Life (or made the *Condition*) instead of that of the Law, upon the account of this Righteousness of Christ Jesus.

We must distinguish here, to avoid Prejudice, (and least the tender be offended.) There is the *Duty*, and the *Condition* of this *Law*, the *Law of Grace*, the *Law of Christ*, or the *Gospel*, by which we are to be judged. God hath constituted the *Duty*, the *Condition*, the *Reward*, the *Penalty* of it. There are few of our Ministers, and much less of our People, are sensible of the Advantage this Doctrine brings us, and the Soundness of it. No Man we must know does perform the *Duty*, but every Man must perform the *Condition*, or he cannot be saved. This *Condition* (as obtained for the World) is the grand Benefit of Christ's Purchase, or main Fruit of his Death, and is accepted when performed, only through him. It is not for my Works or Merits, *sayest thou*, that *my Person is accepted*, but for Christ's Righteousness, and in this alone is my Comfort. And *I say*, it is not for the Works sake, or Merit of any thing, or all we do, but for Christ's sake, that *the Condition is accepted*; and it is in this is *my Comfort*: In this it is that we have, or can have, any grounded Sustentation. To say thou art Justified by Christ's Righteousness, when yet thou must acknowledge his Righteousness is none of thine, unless thou hast performed the *Condition*, What empty Comfort is that? But to say that through Christ's Merits and Righteousness, this it self that I do, is the *Condition*; here is Comfort indeed. That what we are enabled by his Grace (*I say*) to do, how little soever, if sincerely done (if it be but the Grain of *Mustard seed* in a *hungering and thirsting after Righteousness*;) shall be accepted unto Life (that is, be *that Condition*) upon account of what Christ

bath done for us, this I say is solid Consolation. Thou saist, when I look on my Works my Heart sinks, I am not sure I am Sincere, but in the Righteousness of Christ I am safe. I say this is certain, If thou art not Sincere, thou art not Safe: And when I doubt whether I am or nor, I can have no Support but in this, that I hope I am, I trust I am; and that it is upon the Satisfaction and Merit of Christ, that Faith, that Hope does depend. For, that there is any Condition at all, that the Condition is such, that what I do shall be accepted as the Condition performed, it must all be put upon the account of Christ's Performance, or Merit, in our behalf; and his Merit is sufficient, however imperfect be our Duty, for its Acceptance with God. When then upon a Sense of my Deficiency, instead of sinking, I grow bolder in my reliance on Christ's Merits, and God's Mercy, I do not presume on my self, but I magnifie his Grace, and the higher I raise my Faith thereupon (provided I live not willingly in any Conscience-wasting Sin) the more Glory (am I humbly perswaded) do I give my gracious Saviour, and good God. Thou Man, hast the Comfort to apply to *thy self* Christ's Merits, if thou hast performed the Condition: But I have the Comfort to apply Christ's Merits to *the Condition*, which makes his *Yoke easie* and *burden light*, as to the Performance; and my very Desires and weakest Endeavours to find Acceptance.

When I read such Prayers of *David*, that God would not enter into Judgment with him, that he would not be *extream to mark* what he had done *amiss*, for then he could not abide it, and that yet he will have God to *search him*, and try his *Reins and Heart*, and the like, I cannot but be convinced, that in the Acceptance of such an imperfect Righteousness as he accounted his was, through God's meer gracious Condescension, Mercy and Forgiveness to him, he placed his * Justification;

in which sense also he calls him *the God of his Righteousness*: When as for any acceptance of him through the Righteousness of the Messiah to come, a Righteousness without him made his by Faith, which could abide God's strict Justice, I find not the Footstep of one such Thought. To rely therefore (I will say) on Christ's Righteousness as ours, without regard

to

* That there is a Righteousness set forth in the Gospel, as another Righteousness than that of the Law, by which we are to be justified, is signally affirmed, *Rom. 1. 17. Rom. 3. 21, 23. Now is the Righteousness of God revealed.* The doing what the Law requires, and nothing less, is Righteousness, the Righteousness of Man I will call it. If any one did that, it would and must justify him. *The Doers of the Law before God are justified, Rom. 2. 13.* The Apostle still so accounts (which we must know) and tells us thereupon, that no Man, Jew or Gentile,

to any thing *within*, or without regard to the Condition, is *self-deceiving*: But to rely on God's Mercy, and on Christ's Merits, for acceptance of what we do, and Pardon for the Failings, is *Substantial Religion*; and of *Justification by Faith in Christ's Blood*, a good Exposition.

Righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy he saved us, and yet by Regeneration (it follows) and renewing of the Holy Ghost, Tit. 3. 5. How is that? Are we saved by (at least not without) Works wrought in us by the Spirit or Grace which regenerates us, and yet, *Not of Works*? Again, *Not of Works*, least any Man should boast (Eph. 2. 9, 10.) yet it follows, *we are created in Christ Jesus to good Works*. To answer this, St. Augustine, and from him the Schools, distinguish of *Opera Natura*, and *Opera Gratia*. We are not saved by Works, or according to Works done in our own strength, but by Works done by Grace. But is this the Apostles meaning? No, I have shewn in my Book of *Justification*, that one thing of three wherein Augustine was out, and hath mislead the Schools, is this Notion of *Grace*. By Grace he understands still this inherent Grace, or Operation of God's Spirit in us, when Paul understands it of that without us, his Favour, or Condescension to us. *Not of Works* but of *Grace*, is all one, as not of *Desert* but of *Favour* only. Grace is *Mercy* without, or contrary to *Merit*. Now when the Papist receives the Solution mentioned, the Protestant generally will have all *Works*, though of the *Regenerate*, to be but *Rags*, and *Christ's Righteousness* alone to save us. But they are both out, for Paul's meaning is plainer than they think. *Not by Works of Righteousness we have done*. The Righteousness which the Jew hath done, is living according to the Law of *Moses*: The Righteousness which the Gentile hath done, is his living according to the Law of *Nature*. There is neither one or the other that fulfil that Righteousness as answers God's Law, so as it should be able to save him, and therefore it is of *Grace* or *Mercy*, that any are saved. By this Key-must that hard Text also be opened, Rom. 9. 16. *So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth Mercy*. What? Is there any that find Mercy, or are saved, but they that *will* and *run*? I answer No, but there is none of them that *will* and *run*, do *will* and *run* so as would save them, if God did not pardon their Failings, and accept their Endeavours through the Merits of Christ. The meaning is, that seeing no Man hath those Works the Law requires to Salvation, it is of *Grace* or of *Mercy*, that we are accepted to Life on *Another Condition*.

Well now, it being of *Grace* that we are Saved or Justified in opposition to *Works*, and it being necessary that those Works be understood of such as the Law requires to justify us, that is, Perfect Works, Meritorious Works, which if we had, we might *boast*, and expect the Reward *as of Debt*; and the reason why we are not justified by Works, being because we have them not, it follows, that there is *another Righteousness* which is to be had, short of that the Law requires to justification, not Perfect, not Meritorious, not such as would make the Reward due of Justice, but such as needs Grace for the Acceptance, (*Therefore it is of Faith that it might be of Grace*), and that I say which we must have; for God cannot account a Man Righteous (which is to justify him) that is not Righteous, his Judgment being according to Truth. And what Righteousness then is that a Man must have, and be found in, but that we call our Evangelical Righteousness, the Righteousness of Faith? *The Just shall live by Faith*. Note it, he is *Just*, *Righteous*, that *lives*, or is Justified: But how Righteous? Not according to the Law, but the Gospel. Hence is the Gospel called the *Ministration of Righteousness*: Hence do we read of a *Righteousness brought in* by the Messiah slain in Daniel: Hence that we are *chosen in Christ to be Holy*, That he hath redeemed us from Iniquity, That the

end (or one end) of his Death or Redemption is to make us *Righteous*, as our Divines still say, but I never found any satisfactory account of it by them. The matter in short is (you may see it fuller in my mentioned Book, p. 43.) that by Christ's Death a Law of *Grace* is obtained, upon which our Faith and Repentance is accepted to Life, or imputed for *Righteousness*, or we made *Righteous* so, when by the Law of *Works* there is none, *no not one Righteous*, or ever could be, in the World. Hence is this Righteousness called the *Righteousness of God*, as being ordained and accepted by him, instead of (that I even now called) the *Righteousness of Man*: And which is of God by *Faith*, instead of such *Works* which the Law required to justification. Hence lastly are we said to be justified by *Faith*, the most single and plain reason whereof is, because that *Faith* to a true Believer, is imputed for *Righteousness*, (Rom. 4. 22, 23, 24.) And Faith is said to be imputed to him for *Righteousness*, because God does account such a one *Righteous*, and deals with him as such, in freeing him from Punishment, and accepting him to Salvation, through the Death and Obedience of our Redeemer.

I have now something more to be farther pondered on this Point. The chief is, That what I have said before about the *Commutation of Persons*, that it is to be held in regard to the *Impetration*, not *Application* of our Redemption, I would offer over again likewise, in regard to the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*. I have said, and say it over, that this Phrase is not found in Scripture, but I will acknowledge the thing in the true sense of it, which is this. Christ Jesus did really obey the Law, and suffer its Penalty for us, which is, in our place or stead. To do a thing now in my stead, is for another to do it, so as to save me the doing it. Christ's Suffering and Obeying, was to save us that Suffering and Obeying. No, says Mr. W. somewhere, *Christ suffered indeed in our stead, that we might not suffer, but not obeyed that we might not obey*. But if Christ obeyed not that we might not obey, he obeyed not in our stead. How is it then? Why Christ obeyed the Law, as the perfect Obedience thereof required was the Condition of Life, and by his obeying it thus, he hath freed us from being under that Condition, that is, from so obeying it (as by his Suffering we are freed from enduring the Curse:) Not by a Cessation of the Duty, or Sanction (Premiant or Penal) of the Law of *Works*; but by the Accession of the Law of *Grace*, because the Sanction of that Law is remedied by this, both being in Christ's hands, neither abrogating the other. To be freed from the Obligation of perfect Obedience, as the Condition of Life does import, or is all one as, or with, to be freed from the Commination of Death upon the least failing thereof; so that the Promisory part of that Law, and Comminatory part, are alike concerned, and must be understood both alike to be of force, or cease, as before shewn. By Christ's Sufferings we are not freed from all Sufferings, or Punishment for Sin, but from suffering the *Curse* in that Punishment:

ment ! So by his Obedience we are not freed from endeavouring and doing what we can to become perfect, but we are freed from the Obligation of the Performance, as necessary to Salvation.

This comes in by the way, but for the *Imputation* now of *Christ's Righteousness*, Christ suffered and obeyed *for us* I say, which must be understood aright. Nor that God looks on us, as if we our selves had obeyed or suffered either in his Person, or he to have done it *strictly* in ours; but that he obeyed and suffered *loco nostro*, to free us from so Obeying and Suffering as he himself did, which is the making his Death and Obedience ours only as to this Benefit. Thus much being right, and the Righteousness of Christ consisting in this Obedience, and suffering of this in our room, now what at last is the *Imputation* of it? Why certainly the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, is and must be nothing else, but God's accounting the matter to be thus as it is. Here is the Point, That what Christ hath done, is lookt upon, is accepted as done in our behalf, or the granting it to be so; that upon this Obeying and Suffering of his in our place, as the *Meritorious Cause*, we shall be freed from the same Obedience and Suffering our selves, as the *Effect* of it. This is the only Fundamental Truth in the Phrase, and this Imputation then of Christ's Righteousness (which Man hath so phrased) going into this Grant on God's part, or obtaining the Grant on Christ's part, which precedes the Application, it cannot go into the Application it self (that follows after upon the Performance of the Gospel-terms) so as to make Christ's Righteousness ours, any otherwise than in this Benefit only.

Besides this, the fancying such Acts in God, as the imputing Christ's Righteousness to every single Person upon his Believing, any otherwise than by that one Act of Grace now promulgated in the Gospel, is not becoming the Divine Being. There is, there can be no new Acts in God: He is *Actus purus*; his Will one. I must not grow too Subtle here, only I must say there is his *Will*, and the *Effects* of his Will, and in those Effects there is an Order. In that Order the Righteousness of Christ precedes the Impetration of all the Benefits we have by him, as the Meritorious Cause of them; and the Impetration precedes the Application; and the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness going to the Impetration, the Application cannot but be of the Effects thereof: Not of this *Righteousness* (I say) *it self* (in se,) but of the *Benefits themselves* we have by it.

To

To be more short, That Commutation of Persons, and Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, (which come both in earnest to this one same thing, *Mans Benefit for Christ's Satisfaction*) how soever the Thoughts thereof have amused so many good Men, when you have thoroughly considered them, and made as much of them as ever you can, it must all of it, every drop of it you can make, go into that Act of Grace (*Salvation upon Gospel-Conditions*) which is already procured and passed. Unto the Impetration then of our Redemption, Christ's Righteousness was indeed imputed in it self: In the Application it can be imputed only in the Effects.

I know there are some Texts, very high Texts, about this matter in Scripture, such as these, *He hath made him Sin for us, that we may be made the Righteousness of God in him. By the Obedience of one many shall be made Righteous. Christ is the end of the Law to the Believer.* What is the meaning of such Texts? The meaning really I take to be but the same I have now opened. They all come to this, That Christ by his Satisfaction and Obedience, hath procured us such a Freedom from the Law, that *Faith without Works* (that is, Legal Works) may be imputed to us for Righteousness, which is all one as that we may become Righteous upon performing only the Terms of the Gospel.

Christ is the end of the Law. How? I answer, If I say, by putting an end to it, I speak what is plainest. This is to give it its own proper Interpretation. But how hath Christ done that? He hath done it by satisfying and obeying it (I have said) in our stead. He hath by the Merit of his Obedience procured our Deliverance from the Obligation to perfect Obedience as the Condition of Life. This is such an end of the Law as will hold, and can never be contradicted. I will confirm it with the words following, *Christ is the end of the Law, for Righteousness to him that believeth.* There are two Questions here will go to the heart of this Text: *What is the end of the Law, and Why there is an end of it?* For the *What* we see, The end of the Law is this Freedom (as I say) from the Condition mentioned. For the *Why*, the Text says it is *for Righteousness to him that believeth.* Now what is the meaning of these words? Is it that by believing we make Christ's Righteousness ours, and thereby are Justified? No, it is that by believing (true believing, which is also obeying the Gospel) we may be (*made*, as one of the Texts has it) *Righteous*, and being so, be accounted so of God, and dealt with as so, not Legally, but Evangelically so, and accepted in that Righteousness of

of God (See my Book of *Justif.* p. 57, 58.) opposed to the *Righteousness of Works*, unto Eternal Life. This St. *John* teaches, *He that doeth Righteousness is Righteous*, and Christ's own mouth hath confirmed, *And the Righteous to Life Everlasting*. As for that Text which is like still to be laid in our way, the first of those that in the words I have quoted, (to wit, 2 Cor. 5. 21.) I will accumulate thus much, that, *In Christ's taking on him our Sins, to become a Sacrifice for them, and fulfilling the Law, to procure those new terms, in performance whereof we are accepted as Righteous through his Merits,* does the *Commutation* we find there consist; yea, as I have intimated a little before, even that whole *Commutation of Persons*, with which our Brethren do so puzzle themselves, and vex Mr. W. I would not have them offended with me as with him, though I speak out what he does not, that, here in good earnest is the full of the matter, and (excepting the Darknels of Prejudice, which in most is as dark as Pit) there is no more in it.

This being so, I must not admit any such Interpretation of the place, that is framed according to our common Doctrine, which teaches, that by Faith we receive Christ's Righteousness, that this receiving makes it ours; and that God then reckons us, as having performed the Condition of the Law in Christ, and so justifies us by it. All which is quite contrary to the words of this Text, that says, *Christ is the end of the Law*; and to this meaning, in regard to its Condition, seeing this Doctrine makes the Law to have no end, but to stand to the great day; and that by this Condition we are to be Justified, subverting not only this Text, but the whole Gospel. This yet is most evident in the Verses following, for the Apostle distinguishing the *Righteousness of the Law*, and the *Righteousness of Faith*, makes this Righteousness to be the *confessing with the Mouth*, and *believing with the Heart*, which are Acts of ours, and not the Obedience of Christ without us imputed: So that if you shall give πλσ any other signification than this, the Scope yet and Purpose of the place must be the same. I have staid so long on this Text, because I have omitted it, when I paraphrased the others in my Book of *Justification*, where all I say here, and more, is made out.

I know there are Divines, who make Justification to lye in Pardon altogether, and say we are made *Righteous* in such Texts, only by being pardoned. The being freed (say they) from the Guilt of all Sin, both of Omission and Commission, does introduce Righteousness, as the expelling Darknels does Light, and

for a Sinner to be justified or *made Righteous*, must be by a Righteousness in regard to the *Sanction* of the Law, when in regard to the *Preceptive* part, no Man is Righteous in himself or in Christ, whose Suretyship does reach so far and no farther. This do they indeed very cleverly say; Nevertheless I am convinced, that the Apostle by *Justification* (when he discourses of it to be by *Faith* and not *Works*) means not *Pardon*, which is an *Effect* thereof (I count) not the *formal reason*. I have one Argument for this convinces me in my Book of *Justification* (the late second Edition 48.) which yet another perhaps may frame for me something better. I observe also that the Scripture denominates Men Righteous still from their *walking uprightly*, not from *Pardon*, P. 22. I have more elaborately evinced, that the Righteousness of God in opposition to *Works* is *this*, that I stand upon P. 27, 40, 57, 58. And upon the same account (I have added farther in a Note here) is the Gospel called the *Ministration of Righteousness*. See what I there offer (P. 43.) if it doth not evince it. By such Notices as these (which *abunde* too, I must say, I have not had) am I confirmed in my own Opinion.

Another word still with Mr. W. That God does ^{not} look upon us (or account) that we Suffered and made Satisfaction legally in Christ's Person, or that Christ Suffered and made Satisfaction strictly in our Persons (which I count to be all one, or hitherto have,) and yet that Christ suffered in our place or stead, Mr. W. and I both hold. Now both these I take to be consistent, because Christ's Sufferings and Satisfaction is ours, or in our place, or stead, only in regard to the Effects: But if he suffered and satisfied in our place or stead (or his Satisfaction be ours) any more, or otherwise than as to the Effects, I perceive than neither his Brethren on one side, nor I on the other, can see by what distinction, unless by words only, without the thing that makes the difference (when these Distinctions without a Difference do still quite spoil all) he can evade us, but that he must come over quite to me, or them, let him choose which. Believe it, Christ *did* in our stead, is by Interpretation only, the *Believer Unpunished*.

What Mr. W. offers upon this account in his *Man made Righteous*, p. 76 to 83. I have considered, and it is but an honest thing to give a Man his weight. Christ's Righteousness is double he counts, either his Performance of the *Mediatorial Covenant*; or his *Right to the Reward* being performed. The one is a Righteousness in relation to the *Precept*, the other in relation to the *Pre-*

miant

miant Sanction. The former Righteousness is imputed to the Believer (he says) *Mediately*, which is, I think, but the same I say, it is imputed only in regard to the Effects. This is the Simile he uses, and the Explication makes good. God looks on what Christ did and suffered (he urges) as done *for us*, and therefore what he did and suffered is *ours* as to the *Benefits*: But God does not look on what Christ did and suffered as *done by us*, and therefore what he did and suffered is *ours* no otherwise. The latter, Righteousness then he says is imputed to Believers *Immediately*, which he explains thus. A part of that Reward Christ hath a Right to, is to have a Seed, that they shall believe and be pardoned. Now Believers have this Right, which Christ hath, that they shall be pardoned, *It is made theirs; They have not only the Benefits, but are invested in Christ's Right to those Benefits; They have not only a Right to Pardon, but have Christ's Right to that Pardon.* This he says, but how can this be? Christ's Right to his Reward is as properly his own Righteousness, and inherent in him, as his Righteousness of Obedience. Both are Accidents in him as their Subject. One of them, the Righteousness of his Obedience, cannot possibly be *ours in it self*, because Accidents do not *Migrare à subjecto in subjectum*, and how can Mr. W. say so of this? If he does not make this *Right of Christ* to be *ours in se*, it is as good as to say nothing. And when the Obedience of Christ is not *in se* ours but by *Imputation*, and that only in the *Effects*, how the *Right to the Reward*, which is Christ's Right, can be *so ours*, without this *Migration* (which is impossible.) I am yet to consider, and digest not. We cannot be made *inherently* Righteous by his Righteousness, and how shall we be *so* enrightened by his Right? But after this, If Christ's Right it self (or his Right *in se*) be not the Believers, but only the *virtue* of it, then is there here a Cobweb spun finely, when all comes but to an *Imputation* of this *Right*, as well as of his Obedience, as to the Effects only. I conclude, either then there is nothing at all in this, or if there be something, so as he may come off in his saying, that *Besides the Effects, the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed*, it is a coming off but with a Fallacy (*fallacia dictionis*;) For he understands that Righteousness of Christ, which is so called in relation to the *Sanction*; and we speak altogether of his Righteousness in relation to the *Precept* of the Law of Redemption.

I must yet add, If Mr. W. will stand to it, that the very Righteousness of Christ (without equivocating) is imputed to us

besides (or any more than in regard to) the *Effects*, then let him say, that Christ obeyed and suffered not only *for us*, or *in our stead*, but also *in our Persons*, taking it too in their own sense, and so make a full end with his Brethren. But I argue, If Christ obeyed and suffered so *in our Persons*, as well as *for us*, and *in our stead*; Then should not we obey at all; Then should not we suffer at all; for he that hath perfectly obeyed, can be punished for nothing; Then should we need no Forgiveness; Then would Christ's Sufferings for us having obeyed be needless; Then must he be lookt on by God as the Sinner; Then must the *Culpa* as well as the *Pena* be imputed to him; Then could not Christ be our Mediator, because he is the Offending Party, and a Mediator is a third Party between the Offender and the Offended; in which Person he obeyed and suffered for us. Then lastly should Impunity and Life be due to us immediately by a meer Resultancy from his Obedience and Sufferings, and not be given by the Interposition of a new Law or Covenant upon terms as they are according to the Gospel, which is subverted therefore by that Opinion. Once more, If Christ suffered in our Persons, then should he have borne the *same* Sufferings, and if they were the *same*, they could not be *instead of Ours*.

You may say the Righteousness of Christ in it self is *imputed* to us, though it be not *Ours*, only in the *Effects*: But Mr. W. must not come off so, for I say, To be imputed in it self, is to be *Ours* by Imputation, that is, *Judicially Ours*, which draws the same Consequences, as *Ours in it self*.

But I pray let us consider a little in good earnest, what is in this Conception of Mr. W. that *besides the Effects being made Ours, the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed*; Is there any thing in it, or nothing in it? Is it of any or no Signification? Certainly if his meaning comes not to thus much, that besides the Effects, Christ's Righteousness it self is *ours* also by Imputation, it is an idle, impertinent, vile Trifling with us (which in regard to Mr. Baxter, is not to be spoken without some Resentment) in so exquisite a matter: If he will grant his meaning to be thus much, that though Christ's Righteousness cannot be inherently *Ours*, yet it is indeed *Ours by Imputation*, then is he come quite home to his Brethren, who never said, or intended any other.

After this I argue, If Christ's Righteousness be imputed to us in it self, Then were it *pleadable* by us, as if *we our selves had done and suffered what Christ did*, which Mr. W. does in effect allow,

or without Tergiversation must, *Gospel Truth*, p. 39, 40. And also, Then must God have dealt with us, as if we had; which he does more positively allow, P. 42. *To impute to one* (says he) *what is suffered by another, is to deal with him as if he himself had suffered.* But God hath not dealt thus with us; and we cannot plead so with him, which appear by the said Consequences. It is not all one as if we had done and suffered in Christ, what he did and suffered for us, for *Satisfaction* is another thing than this. It is not all one in other respects; it is as good for us only in the obtained (when attained) *Effects*.

P A R T I V.

THERE remains now one thing, and a chief thing, yet to be done, which is, to offer something that may serve to reconcile such Brethren at least as agree in the main, though it cannot such as quite differ in the Point. I shall first dilate a little more for lights sake, and so be lead thereto by the matter it self. Christ in Scripture is said to dye *for us*, and to dye *for our Sins*.

For our Sins he may be said to dye or suffer in these two senses. *For our Sins*, To expiate them, to deliver us from them, the Guilt and Condemnation due to us for them: *For our Sins*, As the Meritorious Cause of his Death and Sufferings, upon his voluntary undertaking that Expiation. Both these Senses are good, and to be retained.

For us may have a double Sense also, *Loco nostro*; or *Bono nostro*. In our *stead*; or in regard to our *Benefit*. The Socinians will have Christ to dye for us only *bono nostro*, which they fetch about too; so as makes his dying for us of no more concern than a Martyr's. Christ by his Death confirmed his Doctrine: This makes us believe it: His Doctrine teaches a Holy Life: By a Holy Life we leave Sin. Christ therefore dyed for our Sins. But we hold Christ dyed *loco nostro*, in our *stead*, in our *room*.

Now, *In our stead*, or *loco nostro*, may have again a double Interpretation.

In our stead, As representing our Persons, so that God looks on us as having done and suffered what Christ did and suffered for us. As what my Attorney or Delegate does for me, I am accounted to have done. He is the Agent *Naturally*, but *Civilly* or *Legally* it is I: In this Interpretation we are not to hold Christ dyed

died in our stead, for that draws all those mentioned Consequences after it, which must carefully be avoided.

There is another Interpretation then of Suffering in our stead. *In our stead*, that is, To save us from Suffering our selves; and this is the Sense we are first to know to be the right, and then stand by it. To do any thing or suffer it in the room of another, I have said, is to do or suffer that thing that the other may escape it, and in this right sense it is, that *Grotius* understands Christ's dying for us, and speaks of a *Commutation* or *Subrogation* of Christ's Person in the room of ours in his Sufferings for us, as the Beast was subrogated in the place of him that Sacrificed it. If any stretch such words of his farther than so, they abuse both their Understanding and him.

Now when this *In our stead*, in usual speaking, is Suffering or doing in our Person, I am brought at last to a pause, as to the words we use, That Christ suffered and obeyed in our Persons, is said by our Divines without scruple, and *Dr. Bates* does but handsomely express what they speak ordinarily. Nay *Mr. Baxter* does acknowledge that these words may be used, if we put a right Sense on them. And what is that Sense? The Sense that must be put on them, if right, is indeed to confound these two things, which I, and *Mr. W.* and *Mr. Baxter* too, do so carefully distinguish otherwise, that is, Christ's Suffering in our stead, and in our Persons. Let these two Expressions then be understood as one and the same thing, and either of them may be used. If the saying Christ suffered in our Persons, as Christ suffered in our stead, be taken in the first sense of *In our stead*, so as to draw on these Consequences, I say we must deny that he suffered in our Persons, or died in our stead, the Saying is *Antinomian*: But if it be made to signifie no more than Suffering in our stead, in the second Interpretation of *In our stead*, that is, so as not to draw those Consequences, the Saying is *Orthodox*, and we may allow it. Thus much is safe and sure, from whence it appears, that some Distinction here in other words, the members whereof (*Membra dividenda sunt contraria*) being made such as all these said Consequences may be attributed to one of them, and none of them to the other, so that we could simply, only by granting the one Branch, and denying the other, reconcile in this matter, might do better. Suppose then I should recall those words, a little above where I count (or hitherto have) Christ's Suffering and Obeying in our Persons, and our Obeying and Suffering
Christ's

Christ's Person to be all one; and instead of distinguishing between, in our *Stead*, and in our *Persons*, make these to be two things, I say, make this the Distinction upon which to set all right, by saying that Christ obeyed and suffered in our *Persons*, understanding only in our *Stead* in the right sense declared, but denying that we suffered and obeyed in his *Person*, or that God does look on us as legally to have obeyed and satisfied in him, because of those Consequences (I say still) before mentioned, which if proposed by way of Argument against it, none can answer. (Let Dr. Bates try, and if he cannot, Mr. Lobb must not in Modesty think he can,) Would not this do our work?

I crave here Mr. W's Attention, because in a Discourse I had last with him, he distinguished thus. He held he said a Commutation of *Person*, but not of *Persons*. I ask'd him if he had read the Distinction in the *Civil Law*, and if he had his Author I should like it well. We know the Scripture says, Christ *died for us*, and obeyed *for us*, and that is we say in our room, in our stead. It no where says, we sinned in his stead, our Sins were not *for him*, though he bare them. He suffered and obeyed in our *Person as in our Stead*, I have said, there is a Commutation of *Person*; but we suffered not, and obeyed not in his *Person* (seeing these Consequences aforesaid follow upon that,) so there is not of *Persons*. And what if Mr. W. and I should have fallen here into the same Conception? Nay, what if Dr. Bates, whose Book is cited against Mr. W. should have been so profoundly careful of his words, that though he hath so amply owned the *Sinner* and *Christ* (as his Surety) to be *one* in Law, *Judicially one*, as to the paying our Debts, or bearing our Punishment, or in doing and suffering what we ought to have done and suffered, hath yet never express'd them *One-so*, as that God accounts us to have obeyed and suffered in him? I cannot say it, but if he hath, then are we very lucky in this: And why may we not agree thus (as I say) with that worthy and beloved Man? Christ was indeed *Our Substitute*, but we not *Christ's*: He obeyed and suffered in *our Person*, but not we in *His*; and if we did not obey and suffer in *his Person*, then must not his Righteousness be *Ours* neither, but in the *Effects*. Let the Doctor choose here whether he will cleave to his old Friend Mr. Baxter, or his new Mr. W. and let Mr. W. consider himself who is likeliest to have seen deeper, he or Mr. Baxter, into the Bowels of this Point. This I stand upon, God looks not on us as the Performers of what
Christ.

Christ performed in our behalf; and in our behalf, in our stead, or room, to suffer, I have said, and said, is to suffer that *We* might not suffer. To say then that Christ's Suffering is *Ours* (or accounted *Ours*) is to forget what Suffering *in another's room* does mean. If Christ suffered and obeyed (I press it) in our stead, place, room, that we might not suffer and obey (in the sense in due place explained) then did not; then could not he suffer and obey so, as that God should look on us as if we have *suffered and obeyed in him*. This is a Contradiction, and he that says Christ's Righteousness it self is *imputed* to us as *ours*, is involved in it.

Mr. *Rutherford* argues, *If Christ paid the Law Debt of Satisfaction, which the Elect in their Persons should have paid, and thereby freed them from the same, he sustained the Person of the Elect* (or our Persons) *in his Sufferings*, Co. Op. p. 251. I answer, We will grant to him here the use of such words, Christ *sustained our Person*, or *suffered in our Persons* in this sense quoted, that through Satisfaction given by him to the *Law-giver*, Elect Believers are freed from satisfying the *Law* themselves (the Language thus pruned, for the *Law* was not executed, or *Law-Debt* paid, but *Satisfaction* given to save its Execution on the Debtor:.) But when he confounds the Use with the other Sense also as one, that in Christ's *sustaining our Person*, God does account us to have suffered and satisfied in his, he is fallen into this Inconsistency, that neither *Rutherford* nor *Bates* (I doubt,) nor *Williams* himself, hath sufficiently observed. What is done in our stead, or in our Person, in the one Sense, cannot be so in the other. If God (I must say it again) will have Christ to *sustain our Persons* in his Sufferings, that we might not Suffer, then must we not also *sustain His*, as that God should account us to have suffered. This is the Inconsistency, and the Reader must pardon me the forced Repetition.

Mr. *W.* (who I say is included here) does tell us, (*Man made Righteous*, p. 62, 63.) *That the Righteousness of Christ, as the performed Condition of the Reward, was a Federal Righteousness, above what was to be Man's Righteousness by the Law of Works*, which he exemplifies in several Instances. I argue against him hereupon, *Therefore the very Righteousness of Christ it self cannot be imputed to us, but is imputed to us in the Effects*. It was in our stead, therefore not ours *in it self*: It was in our stead, and therefore ours *in the Benefit* of it, and in the Benefit only.

Thus

Thus much for Mr. *W.* with whom I am concerned, because we being so near of Opinion, I would have that Satisfaction from him, as to take these Matters between us into his second Thoughts, and to consider what I offer, so as if there be light, or right Notion in it, he may make it more clear by the fulness of his Expression (when mine is barren,) and indeed tell what Dr. *Bates* should mean, and what I do mean, better perhaps than my self. I do conjure him, so far as he is convinced, not to be ashamed to own the Truth, however naked it be here, and without Friends: Or else to give me sufficient reason for my return to his Temper, which seems to me such, as to let his Opinion be that, or no other but that, which he can so defend against his Adversaries, as to lose no Repute with his Followers.

For Mr. *Lobb* I am not concerned, for whether I differ with him in all, or not at all, we leave one another to our own Judgments. It is the words of others he hath quoted, and I apprehend himself free to his own Opinion, wherein I know he hath had, and may have, Candour and Latitude; which may be therefore the same with mine, as theirs, if he will, and if he will not, he may choose. He is one that for his Industry in reading Books, and good Temper upon it I do value; and though there be some that are stumbled, at the Interest he had in King *James's* Court, I judge, that seeing it was laid out mainly to get and maintain their Liberty, the Brethren have little reason to censure, and much less to envy it. Mr. *Lobb* (I must tell some) had no Gift from that King. King *James* indeed knew how to toul Men into him by Liberty of Conscience, and make that a Shooing-Horn to have drawn Popery upon the Nation, if he had not been prevented: But any one may easily believe, he never had such a Heart to any Nonconformist Protestant, as to build us a Synagogue. I had written about a side upon this account, but blotting out the rest, I will let thus much stand, that upon this Interest of Mr. *Lobb*, I had Admittance once into King *James's* Presence, and having spoken what I came about, and something concerning his Dispensing with the Law, I said thus to him, That if he would maintain that Dispensing Power, which I counted he then exercised, he changed his Government, and the People would fight with him, and their Cause be good. I spake it in such words, and sowe the same (as Mr. *Lobb* can witness) that are in the ensuing Paper, which I printed lately by it self for serving the present Generation, according to my Mite; but knowing how such

single Papers are used, torn, burnt, lost, and having at first wrote it in these Sheets, I did not intend but it should also come out with them: In a Book it will be kept, and I Prognosticate too, will remain, to that Age to come, wherein no Man will be found, that dare write or say the same. That Doctrine was accounted good in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time, which in King *Charles* and King *James's* was made Treason, and now in King *William's* hath been Justified.

Memorie Sacrum.

WHereas there have been some that fear God, of all Ranks, the higher and meaner Rank and Conditions, Clergy and Laity, that could not submit to the Present Government, so as to take the Oath of Fidelity to the King, nay nor so much as come to the Liturgy (whereof otherwise they were so fond) because of the Prayers that are there said for him: And whereas there are now many more, that though they have Sworn Allegiance to *William* as King *de Facto*, they cannot come to an Acknowledgment of him as King *de Jure*, so as to Associate in a Cordial Defence of him with others; All which Doubts depend upon the sole Question about King *James's* Conscionable Exclusion; wherein it is not merely out of Interest, (as most selfish Men will think) Humour, or Inclination, that they are gravell'd, but out of Conscience grounded on the *Thirteenth to the Romans*: And soasmuch as I wrote a Book in the year 1680. printed for *R. Clavel*, Entitled, *A Peaceable Resolution of Conscience, touching our present Impositions*, wherein I have spoken for Loyalty against Resistance, not only as much, (for it is a Political Book) but more in one Vertical Point than others, and too much upon further Knowledge than is fit for our English Government: I do think meet, for the rectifying my self, and an humble Tender for others Satisfaction, (especially such devout Loyalists as have forsaken what they had, rather than the Confession they once made in so solemn a Declaration and Subscription, which was then enjoyned all Conformists, That it is not Lawful to take Arms against the King upon any Pretence whatsoever) to bear this Testimony to that Text of the Apostle, and leave it on Record before I dye, being now 75 years Old, for the sake of Posterity. The words are these, *Let every Soul be subject*

subject unto the Higher Powers: For there is no Power but of God. The Powers that be, are Ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.

There are two Distinctions here necessary to be known; To offer more, were to Confound, not Edifie. One is, between *Subjection* and *Obedience*. It is Dr. Field's Distinction in the *Words*, and in the *Meaning* none of those that are for the Doctrine of *Non-resistance* and *Passive Obedience*, but will so far agree with us. We are not always to *Obey* the Higher Powers (Themselves must acknowledge) but we are (they say) always to be in *Subjection*, and never *Resist*, rise up, and deliver our selves from them. If God forbids what the Magistrate commands, or if God commands what he forbids, God must be obey'd rather than Man. This by their Word [*Passive*] they assent unto; but, as to the Point of *Subjection*, it is in that, the Question and Difference lyes between us. The other Distinction then is, what They have not yet known, nor was it ever yet used before by any that I know, unless perhaps my self. The *Sense* almost all have, but not the *Elucidation*. Distinguish we then between these two things, which certainly are different things, the Powers *that are*, and the Powers *that are* * *not*. This is a plain Distinction, every one can understand it, and it is undeniable. The Powers, the

* There may be a *Pretended Power*, where there is None: Such as was King James's *Dispensing Power*, and his *Commissions* now.

Higher Powers in the Text are '*As tous Esous*, the Powers *that be*. This is certain and express, *the Powers that be*, are the Powers in the Text, the Powers that are of God, the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation. Let this be granted to these Devout Men; but then must they grant to me again what cannot be denied by any, that as for the Powers *that are not*, the Powers (I say) that are not *the Powers that be*, they are not the Powers in the Text, not the Powers that are of God, not the Ordinance of God, and they that resist *them*, (and not the Powers *that be*) shall not receive to themselves Damnation. This is is plain and undeniable as before.

Now there is one Question to be ask'd, which alone will resolve the whole Case at stake between us, and that is this: What is the true Meaning of the '*As tous Esous*? What is really

and in good earnest (so as the Conscience may rest upon it,) *That, which is meant by the Powers that be?* I Answer, *The Powers that be*, are certainly the Powers according to the pre-

* *Augustus* brought in a New Constitution into the Roman Government, the People consenting: And *Nero* was Obeyed, and not to be Resisted, as supposed Ruling thereby.

sent known • Constitution. There are Higher Powers (or Kings) whose Government is Absolute; and so Absolute, as that Subjects have no Liberty of Person, or Propriety in Goods, by the Constitution: But it is not so with other

Higher Powers (or Kings) whose Government is according to a supposed Original Contract (appearing in the Laws) which gives the People such Liberty and Rights, as the King such a *Prerogative*, extending so far, and no farther than the Contract allows. There is here therefore two things to be considered, the *Potestas*, and *Forma Regiminis*; the Power and the Form in such Governments. The Form or Constitution (which tells what sort of Government it shall be, what Persons shall Govern, and how far they may go) is of Men, (of Men altho' her, unless in the *Few* Commonwealth) and then the Power does flow from GOD to Rule so, and no otherwise, but according to that Constitution. *Potestas est à Deo*, but *Forma ab Hominebus*, says Bishop *Andrews*. If then the Higher Powers for the Administration Rule not by that Form, or according to that Constitution, (but designedly and resolvedly, and not by a slip and meer Inadvertency, depart from it,) the Power *à Deo*, the *Potestas*, fails them; and they do *Cadere de Jure*, fall from their

*A Dispensing Power indefinitely maintain'd, is a Power over the Laws. A Power over the Laws, subverts the Government. A Change of Government Absolves the Subject from his Allegiance.

Right to our Subjection. • I have thought on this long, I was at Oxford when I compos'd that Book forementioned, and had the Use of the Library, and I pitch'd on this as the Texts Fundamental Exposition, That *the Powers that be*, are the Government in every Country according

to its own Constitution: And consequently, that the *Subjection* (or Non-Resistance) which is required of God as due to the *Higher Powers*, is a Subjection (or Non-Resistance) no other but according to the same. Look you Sirs, the Scripture does not go to prescribe, alter, or meddle with the Governments of the Nations, but it supposes a Government in every Kingdom or Country, and commands Subjection to the Government that

is. We overturn all if we Preach otherwise than thus, *Evangelium non abolet Politias*.

* When Luther had taught that the Magistrate should not be Resisted, and some Lawyers prov'd him, that the German Empire was not Absolute, but

that the Laws thereof permitted Resistance, he then held they might make a League to defend themselves; Upon this Reason, Because (said he) the Gospel abolishes not the Laws of any Commonwealth, Sleidan lib. 8. Note here in the way, That if William be Lawful King, King by Law, then he must be Rightful King [King in *foro Interiori*, unto whom Subjection is due, not for *Wrath*, but *Conscience-sake*; King in *foro Dei Sive Conscientia*, and not in *foro Exteriori Sive Humano* only:] Upon the same Reason, Because the Gospel, the Word or Laws of God does *supponere*, not *ponere* any thing in this Matter, but according to the Law of the Land.

Now then let us come to the Government of our Nation, and this Government we all know (and none more like than these Men to stand by it) is *Banckia νομική*, as Sir Thomas Smith, the Secretary of State in two Reigns, hath told us in his Authenrick Book, *De Republica Anglicana*: That is, *A Government regulated by Laws*, a Government which is *Kingly* by the Statutes of the Realm, and not at the Will of the Lord. *Non est Rex ubi Voluntas imperat, non Lex*, says Bracton; and so say all our Great Lawyers. Well! Such being the Constitution of our Government, Be it Known and Acknowledged, That if any King of England therefore shall Rule so (or really go about it so, that if he be not hindered, he will effect it) as to change the Government, or Manner of the Kingdom (as the Scripture expresses it) from *Legal* to *Arbitrary*, from *Regal* to *Despoticall*; and it shall please God to give the People, who are Free Subjects, the Happy Means of a Deliverance, they do not resist in this Case, or rise up against the Powers that be, the Powers in the Text, the Powers that are of GOD, the Ordinance of GOD: But the Powers not in the Text, the Powers that are not of GOD, the Powers that are not the Ordinance of God, and it being indeed only a Rising for the Government, and not against the Government, and no resisting the Powers that be, they shall not receive to themselves Damnation. This is the Case of the Revolution. *

* As We know, (says Hooker in larger Words) That they are Lords of such or such Lands, unto whom, in default of Heirs, they fall by Escheat: So does it

rightly follow, seeing Dominion, when there is none to inherit it, (or when it is forfeited) returns to the Body, that it does fundamentally and radically reside in the Body, and that the Inheritors hold it in dependency on them. This Saying of his, I confess in my Judgment, does require that grain of Salt, which is above in the Paper (too much to be explained and adapted to a Marginal Note :) But is so far true to me, as undoubtedly to make the Application. Our Government therefore thus Escheating, or become Forfeit to the People, and they by their Representatives in a Convention, having settled it on William, here is the most certain, true, indubitable Title that any Prince is capable of; and better than any other hath to his Government, for ought I know, in the Earth besides.

Ther

There are two Reasons now (besides the Conscience to my self in regard to the Book forecited) for the Publication; which being apparent, I own. The One, That all Honest Scrupulous Men, who have been hitherto *Non-Jurors* upon the Point of Conscience (as to them) may be so satisfied to take the Oath of Fidelity to King William (with us that have,) as to bless God for him, and to enter the Association, as they see it good for them. The Other, That the King himself, and those that succeed him in the Throne, may not be tempted by the Love of their People, or Liberality of Parliaments, to make such Use of their Raised Strength, as our Neighbour Kings have done, to go out of the Circle of our *English Constitution*: Especially knowing, that the Spirit of the Nation, and the Conscience of it also is hereby so resolved, that under

King James we would not be *Papists*; under those that succeed, We will not be *Slaves*.*

* Having said this for the People, I must say one thing also for the King out of the same Principle. There is the Positive and Negative Power of Rulers. According to our *English Government* it is true, and to be held, that the King can Positively do nothing but according to Law: But it being true also, and to be considered, that the Supreme Law in all Politics is the Common Good; if a Prince, in the use of his Power only, which is Negative, should upon occasion do something otherwise than Law, for the Benefit of the Subject (*Bona fide*) and not his private Ends, I do believe, both Politically, and as a Divine, that he may have a good Conscience in it; and when he has, that he is not to account he acts then against the Law, but according to it, seeing he does Govern in such a Case by the Supreme Law, unto which all others are Subordinate. Not long before King Charles's Death, the Justices were sending Mr. Baxter to Prison for *Conventicling*, but he hearing of it, and being told it might kill the ill good Man, out of his kind Nature, sends word immediately he would have him forborne. To have controul'd the Law to a Man's hurt, it had been Tyranny; but when it was only for Good, without detriment to any, who could open his Mouth against it? It is to be supposed no Law-givers can foresee all Cases that may happen, and when Equity and a good Conscience is against the Letter of the Law, thus much I think Justifiable by the Old Covenant Oath, where the King Swore to execute the Laws, *Cum Justitia & Misericordia*: If not it will be, by that Power our Kings have of granting a *Nolle Prosequi* in some cases to Offenders, and much more by that of Pardoning All *ad libitum*, which a *Mayore ad Minus* cannot but warrant more than this. It is fit that Kings, before they Swear, do understand their Oath to have this Construction, and to know that which is much more to the purpose, that any Law which is against God or Nature, that is, which is against the Law of Nature, or Word of God, or the Common Good, is really in *foro Conscientie*, No Law; so that in the Non-Prosecution thereof, they are not to be condemned. Nay, if a Prince by Malversation, even Positive or Privative, shall render himself Obnoxious to God, and the People, it is good yet for the Subject to bear with him (as we do with Storms) so long as we can; but if the Case comes to that once, as the Nation is in danger of Ruin by it, the Doctrine of Non-resistance, any longer than we can help our selves, is perfect Ignorance of our State, or raving Obstinacy. *Salus Populi Suprema lex esto.*

Habetis Sententiam meam, in Causa hac gravissima.

J. H.

The

The Postscript to the Reader.

THERE are several Pieces, that at several Times, upon several Subjects, I have written, called, *The Middle Way*. One is the *Middle Way of Justification*, which I printed in the year 71 or 72, and reprinted lately 95, upon the account of our Brethrens Difference about that Point. In that second Edition I have gathered up all Passages that concern that Subject, out of the rest of those Papers to put them to it, and took advantage from certain *Exceptions* against Mr. *Williams*, to add something that I thought wanting in a single Sheet, and have here supplied what was yet in my Mind to say farther upon this Occasion. Now if the Reader shall bid the Bookseller stitch these six Sheets, that *one Sheet* (so called) and those eight or nine together, and then shall *take time* to read them, and notice of what he reads (unless he thinks this Point of *Justification* be such, as is not worthy his Time or Thoughts, which was an *Article* of so great Concern to our first Reformers,) and does not meet with something or other in them (and that as an *Original*) which may serve at least *Vice versa* to whet his own Understanding upon them, then is it not I my self only, but *two* of our most eminent Brethren while alive (as appears by their hands put to one of my *Papers*) are deceived. I will add, that if Mr. *W.* therefore shall not now let himself to peruse them, and finding any such Matter which he can improve, or make out better for me than I have done, if he does it not, then am I farther disappointed in one End of this present Work, as also of my believed Estimation of Mr. *Williams*. For according to what a Man's Mind is most upon in such Disputes as these, the Investigation of Truth, or the Defence of ones self, such is his value more or less.

Having yet room, the fear of the want whereof made me put those two Paragraphs (p. 29.) into a Marginal Note, that should else have been part of the Book, I will use it to supply one thing lacking in the single Sheet mentioned. The Sacrifice and Righteousness of Christ's Death and Life, is that which hath procured Pardon and Salvation to every Believing Sinner, upon the account of that Satisfaction God as Rector hath received by it; so that being Legislator also (and above Law) he might with Demonstration too of his Righteousness (relax, and hath relaxed or dispensed with) his Law of Works, requiring another Condition to those Benefits in a new one, the Law of Grace, or the Gospel. This Pardon now and Life (or Grant thereof) upon Condition, being the Grand Fruit

"Fruits of our Redemption, it is a Question between Mr. W. and I, whether the Condition is self, also be a Fruit of Christ's Purchase, which if it be not, derives not yet from our Free Will, but the Grace of Election. It is not agreeable to my Genius to make Christ's Redemption, which I would have One thing and Universal, to be differently influsive on the *Bless* and others. I have opened this Apprehension of mine in that single Sheet mentioned, and there are two Considerations moreover offered against the received Opinion, which I desire Mr. W. to weigh Honestly, and, if he can, to solve me the Difficulty; or if he cannot, to come with me to this Composition. The Lord Christ, by Redeeming the World, and consequently by his Death, hath obtained a Right of Dominion over it, and by that Right does give that Condition to whom he will, *Act. 5. 31.* But though Faith therefore and Repentance, in this remote way about, may be said to be obtained by Christ's Death (as he hath obtained thereby a Power or Right of giving it,) I deny it to be the *immediate Purchase*, or *direct Fruit* of it. I deny that Faith is a Fruit of Christ's Death, in the same manner as Pardon and Life is upon Condition of Faith. I deny that it proceeds from Satisfaction given to God's Justice (which Christ's Death was) though it may from his Merit, or Redundancy of it, as all other Good does, seeing in his Name it is, or through his Merits, that we ask all things at the Hands of God, (as Health, and Wealth, and the like Blessings) which we cannot say yet Christ died that we should have. Again, Christ came and died to Save Man, by restoring him to Righteousness, from whence he is fallen. Now the Righteousness of *Nature*, we never can be in this Life restored to, and there is therefore a Righteousness of *Grace*, which God hath ordained in room of that to Save us, revealed in the Gospel, and it is called the *Righteousness of God*, because of this his Ordination. By the Obedience of Christ we are said to be made *Righteous*, and the *Righteousness of God* in him, or by the Means of him, as one has it. But how by the Means of him? Why, by his Death, but this way about still. Christ died to procure for us a Covenant with another Condition than that of the Old, which performing, we become Righteous that never could be so else; but mark it, when the Condition is purchased, the Performance comes not from thence, but from the Free Gift of God. In the mean time, this Mercy that God hath ordained, and doth accept of such a Condition as we do, or can perform, must not pass without Resentment. Blessed be the God of Heaven for some Sense and Knowledge of this in these Sheets. Blessed be God that it is not a Righteousness of the Law required of us, but a Righteousness of the Gospel. Blessed be God it is not by a Righteousness of Works that we are Saved, but a Righteousness, the Failings whereof are pardoned, and the little Done accepted through the alone Merits of Christ Jesus. Which when they had read, they rejoiced for the Consolation.

Deo Gloria mihi Condonatio.

J. H.

F I N I S.

